

School of Theology at Claremont



10011447978



The Library  
of the  
**CLAREMONT**  

---

**SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY**

1325 North College Avenue  
Claremont, CA 91711-3199  
1/800-626-7820







MAKERS OF THE SCOTTISH CHURCH  
AT THE REFORMATION

*BY THE SAME AUTHOR*

---

A LITTLE SCOTTISH WORLD

IN THE OLDEN TIMES

HALF-HOURS AT THE MANSE

M'CHEYNE FROM THE PEW

PEDEN THE PROPHET

LEISURE HOURS OF A SCOTTISH  
MINISTER

385  
H48  
1920

# Makers of The Scottish Church at the Reformation

By the Rev.

Kirkwood Hewat, M.A., F.S.A. (Scot.)

Prestwick

Edinburgh  
Macniven & Wallace  
1920

Theological Library  
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY  
AT CLAREMONT  
California

*Printed in Great Britain  
by Turnbull & Spears, Edinburgh*



## PREFACE

I HAD intended at first to limit myself to the ' Six Johns '—namely, John Knox, John Willock, John Winram, John Row, John Spottiswood, and John Douglas—who drew up the first Confession of Faith, and the first Book of Discipline; but I found the life of another John—John Craig—to be so interesting, and so mixed up with public affairs, that I felt I must include him also. Moreover, as Craig lived to a great age, dying in the year 1600, and as Winram was born in, or about, the year 1492—he also living to be a very old man—the period covered, I found, would embrace practically a century. Nor perhaps have any other hundred years been so important in Scottish history.

As the life of John Knox has been so often written, I had some misgivings as to whether he should appear here for separate treatment, but it was impossible to exclude him—the greatest of them all, and incalculably influencing all the others. I have not, however, in his case given a biography, but, as stated in the text, have selected certain incidents in his career, features in his character, and aspects of truth he emphasised, which are closely related to the work of reform. I have also laid stress on his ' modern ' spirit.

There are other lives which perhaps some might have expected in this book, but, apart from unduly

lengthening it, I have thought it better to confine myself to Knox's clerical coadjutors. John Erskine of Dun, for instance, played an important part in those times, but, though his life is not dealt with separately, a good deal of information will be found regarding him in these pages. As for the Earl of Moray, a volume of no mean size would be required for him, and one wonders how it is that, apart from encyclopædias and biographical dictionaries, no account of the 'Good Regent' has ever yet appeared. It certainly cannot be for want of material.

Carlyle, as is well known, laid great stress on the personal and human element in history, maintaining indeed that vivid biography was the most pleasant and profitable of all reading. Whether I have made the lives in this book vivid, it is not for me to say, but I have endeavoured to do so. They are closely connected with the religious history of Scotland—touching, or rather moulding, events of capital importance—and I believe their study will throw much light on sixteenth-century days, and bring them nearer to us. It will not fail to be noticed, too, that there is great diversity in the careers of the men described, and that some of them had to do with incidents, more or less important, transpiring far beyond their native land.

In the Preface to his *John Knox*, Dr Hume Brown says that 'from materials that have come to hand of late years, we are led to a conception of the Scottish Reformation, alike in its essential character and in the details of its development, which materially differs from the views presented even by such recent historians

as Tytler and Hill Burton.' If I mistake not, the perusal of the Lives in this work will tend to give a fresh conception of that time of national transition.

Except by James Scott, minister of Perth, at the beginning of last century, and by Robert Wodrow, minister of Eastwood, about a hundred years earlier, it does not appear that the Scottish Reformers have been so dealt with before ; but the former's *History of the Lives of Protestant Reformers in Scotland* is a slender volume, and the latter's *Collections* form just the reverse, and many documents, references, and other valuable sources of information are now available of which these writers were not cognisant. At the end of each Life I have appended a bibliography, and instead of cumbering the pages with foot-notes (the authorities being generally stated in the text), I have relegated supplementary material to the various Appendices. At the time of the Reformation, and for many years after, the spelling was perverse and fluctuating, different authors spelling differently according to their pronunciation, and even in the course of the same work not spelling identical words in a uniform manner. In the quotations or extracts that follow, the spelling and even the grammatical structure and idiom have, in some cases, been altered to suit modern usage, but in others the narrators have been allowed to write in the manner of their times and speak with their Doric intonation. Thus, it may be, we can better know them and their age.

To my co-Presbyter, the Rev. John Warrick, M.A., Old Cumnock, I have to express my indebtedness for helpful revision of the manuscript, and to the Rev.

Charles A. Salmond, D.D., Edinburgh, I am indebted for assistance in correcting the proof-sheets. To my neighbour, Wm. Traquair Dickson, Esq., M.A., F.S.A. (Scot.), W.S.—Vice-President of the Scottish Text Society—I am under obligation for friendly counsel, and for generous access to his valuable library of old Scottish books.

It may be added that the inception and progress of this work owe much to the kind encouragement of the Very Rev. Professor Cooper, D.D., D.C.L., and other members of the Scottish Ecclesiological Society.

K. H.

23 ST BERNARD'S CRESCENT,  
EDINBURGH.



## CONTENTS

CHAP.	PAGE
I. JOHN KNOX . . . . .	I
II. JOHN KNOX ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	57
III. JOHN WILLOCK . . . . .	130
IV. JOHN WINRAM . . . . .	166
V. JOHN ROW . . . . .	223
VI. JOHN SPOTTISWOOD . . . . .	272
VII. JOHN DOUGLAS . . . . .	308
VIII. JOHN CRAIG . . . . .	350
INDEX . . . . .	405



# Makers of the Scottish Church at the Reformation

## CHAPTER I

### JOHN KNOX

THIS is not a biography of John Knox, but a selection of incidents in his life—or of topics he emphasised—which will show the manner of man he was. There will emerge, we believe, from this treatment of his career, features of his character which have stamped themselves, more or less, upon the Scottish people. John Milton spoke of him as that ‘great man, John Knox, the reformer of a nation,’ and this tribute, concise yet comprehensive, is altogether true. Knox was the most *modern* of all his contemporaries, and we believe that to all generations he will appear as a true ‘modern.’ Before we adduce proof of this, let the following pregnant sentences be quoted from *The Cambridge Modern History*, where, in the Reformation volumes, Dr F. W. Maitland, Downing Professor of the Laws of England, in dealing with the Anglican Settlement and the Scottish Reformation, says, ‘Suddenly all far-sighted eyes turned to a backward country. Eyes at Rome and eyes at Geneva were fixed on Scotland, and the further they could peer into the future, the more eager must have been the gaze. And still we look back intently at that

wonderful scene, the Scotland of Mary Stewart and John Knox; not merely because it is such glorious tragedy, but also because it is such modern history. The fate of the Protestant Reformation was being decided, and the creed of unborn millions in undiscovered lands was being determined. . . . A new nation, a British nation, was in the making.'

Let us now see how our contention can be substantiated—that Knox was a true modern.

### *1. He laid stress on Preaching*

We do not say that preaching in itself is an indication of the modern mood or spirit, but when we look at the kind of preaching Knox's was, our contention, we believe, will be made good. There were too many rites and ceremonies in the Romish Church, and the truths which lay behind them were being hidden from, or forgotten by, the people. Knox endeavoured to make the Gospel, and all the great doctrines of the Bible, plain to all. He would make the sacred volume a living book. So he revived preaching. Not only in St Giles', but all over Scotland, he delivered sermons and opened up the Scriptures. Was he not in this following his divine Master—the Incarnate Word—who, in a synagogue at Nazareth, in private houses, by the lake-side, and on a mountain slope, preached the Gospel of the Kingdom of God? Was he not in this like the Apostles who 'daily in the temple, and in every house, ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ,' and indeed everywhere—in all sorts of places in Palestine, and in the regions beyond—'spoke boldly' and 'publicly showed by the Scriptures' what the great truths of salvation and sanctification were? Knox desired to lead men back to the divine sources



of Christianity,—and to get the people to know and understand and appropriate the Evangel (a favourite word of his), as it came fresh and pure from Jesus Christ and His Apostles. The salient truths of the New Testament he had verified in his own experience, under deep conviction of sin and shortcoming, and he wished to impress them on others. With great earnestness he besought men to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ with all His pardoning mercy, His atoning death, and His wondrous efficacious grace; also he would have men personally surrender heart and soul to Him, with resultant growth into His own image by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Knox further felt that God had appointed him to preach these truths, and that when they were believed and practised the reform of the nation would be accomplished.

If we look at Knox's style, we shall find it decidedly modern as compared with what went before, and indeed with much that came after. That it was very direct, all who heard it bear witness. Though it was his rule to speak only from a few notes, he prepared carefully beforehand, our proof of this being a sermon which had been misreported to Queen Mary. He repeated the whole of it to her and her attendants, as it was originally delivered, and those present who had heard it the first time said that his repetition was accurate in every respect. This might be only a tribute to an excellent memory, but surely the sermon must have been one thought out, planned, with many of the words even chosen beforehand, if he could remember it all so well. Though not a learned man like George Buchanan (who always mentions Knox in terms of high respect) or Andrew Melville, he, in spite of his many public duties, was a diligent student, had a competent knowledge of Greek, and learned Hebrew

when he was past middle age. He wrote Latin quite fluently, as we know from a letter of his to Calvin. Did not he also share in the preparation of the Genevan version of the English Bible? Queen Mary thought him a close student, and rather resented his being 'always at his book.' In his *First Blast of the Trumpet* we find quotations from Aristotle, Julian, Ambrose, the Pandects and the Digest. That he spoke French with ease, we know from the fact that he preached at Dieppe in that language, and it is held by some—among them Hill Burton—that his interviews with Queen Mary (at least the first of them) were in that tongue. Bishop Ridley spoke of him as 'a man of wit and learning.' But modern though Knox was and notoriously one who broke with the past, it must be admitted that, while he had a profound contempt for scholasticism, there was a good deal of the schoolman's modes of thought and methods of debate in him, though behind these modes and methods there was certainly with this man an intellectual and spiritual force of which the old schoolmen really knew nothing.

Though only one entire sermon has come down to us, printed under his supervision (for he had to publish it, as the Privy Council had asked explanations from him regarding some utterances therein which had greatly displeased Lord Darnley), he must have delivered a great many sermons in his time. Twice every Sunday he preached in the church of which he was a minister, namely St Giles', Edinburgh, and three times at weekly services besides. Then, on a specified day every week, he met with his elders to discuss matters connected with the oversight of the congregation. In addition, there was a weekly assembly of ministers for 'the exercise in the Scriptures,' in which doubtless Knox would take a leading part. Besides, he was

the preacher for all Scotland, journeying to distant parts, and within churches, or in the open air, preaching the Evangel. Ayrshire, with which the present writer is more closely identified, gave him special welcome when on these tours, and his sermons in Ayr, at Kirkoswald, on Barnweil Hill, and elsewhere, had a wonderful effect on the people. His pulpits in these places are venerated spots to-day. To John Knox as to John Bunyan, the world was a battle-field where divine and satanic forces waged perpetual warfare. Knox saw it all as in a picture, but it was all very real to him. The opposing hosts stood before him, and he heard their words of command and their battle-cries. 'Behold,' he could say in the words of Holy Scripture, 'the mountains were full of horses and chariots of fire round about.' But, as onlooker or combatant, he was not afraid, because he had heard the voice saying—'Fear not; for they that be with us are more than they that be with them.' As with Martin Luther, he never doubted for a moment that the Lord of Hosts was on his side. It was a holy war that was being waged, and the struggle was not with mere shadowy doctrines, but with the spirit of evil incarnated in wicked lives and wicked deeds. Stern his theology might be, but was it not a reflection of the national character? To the Scotsman at that time, the idea of God, as Almighty and All-holy—the God of Mount Sinai—was congenial, just as the *bon Dieu* is to the Frenchman of to-day. It is not strange that Knox, so strong in Christian doctrines—laying much stress on 'the Evangel,' and anchoring himself in St John's Gospel—should have spoken so much from the old Testament and taken precedents from it, for he found in those ancient oracles, or thought he found, divine examples of that government and

of those laws which all must follow, or at their peril disobey.

He certainly preached to the times. He said himself on one occasion that his vocation was to teach 'by tongue and living voice in these most corruptible days rather than to compose books for the ages to come.' This man was no creature of compromise or speaker of soft words. Had he been so, the Scottish Reformation would not have been accomplished. A harsh and rude age, words of fire were necessary for it. The passions were blazing in those stormy times. Knox may have seen some things out of proportion, but he was a prophet, and has not failure or limitation in a sense of proportion been a weakness—albeit a source of strength at the time—with all prophets? Might there not be said of him what was said of Mirabeau by Carlyle—that he was 'a man of instincts and of insights, a man who will glare fiercely on many an object, and see through it, and conquer it, for he has intellect, he has will, he has force beyond other men, a man not with logic-spectacles, but with an eye!' Sins national and individual—corruptions and abuses in church and state—he did not spare. He made his texts—frequently taken from the Old Testament prophets—drag evil deeds into the light, and in his sermons and expositions, plainly, pointedly, and sometimes humorously, he taught high and low, rich and poor, of God's way and God's kingdom. One day, admitting his directness and vehemence, he gave this apology, 'To me it is enough to say that black is not white, and man's tryanny and foolishness is not God's perfect ordinance.' Nor should it be forgotten that the crisis through which his country was passing at the time was as much political as religious, and that the pulpit was the only way open to him, by which he could impress upon the people the great truths



for which he and his fellow-labourers contended, and which he himself believed to lie at the very foundation of national stability and progress.

How different was this from the preaching, or rather non-preaching, of the religious guides of the old church. The Dominican and Franciscan friars used to deliver excellent sermons, but their zeal, piety, and eloquence had gone. They did not now take their texts from Holy Scripture at all, but from a strange book of wonderful tales, the *Gesta Romanorum*, which brought laughter rather than penitent tears. The bishops were not known to preach, and the parish clergy were content with hearing confession and formally going through the service in Latin. The formulæ of the Church had become dead cabalistic signs. Sir David Lyndsay of the Mount, Lord Lyon King-at-Arms, in his *Kitteis Confession*, thus depicts the ministry of the parish priest :—

‘ He me absolvit for ane plack,  
 Thocht he na pryce with me wald mak,  
 And mekil Latyne he did mummil  
 I heard na thing but hummil bummil.  
 He schew me nocht of Goddis Word,  
 Which sharper is than ony sword,  
 And deip intill our hart dois prent  
 Our syn quhare throw we do repent ;  
 He put me na thing into feir,  
 Wharethrow I suld my syn forbeir ;  
 He schew me nocht the maledictioun  
 Of God for syn, nor the affectioun . . .  
 Of Christ’s blude na thing he knew  
 Nor of His promises full trew,  
 That saivis all that wyll believe  
 That Sathan sall us never grieve . . .  
 Of this na thing he cud na tell,  
 But gave me pennance ilk ane day  
 And *Ave Maria* for to say

And Fridays for na fische to eit,  
 But butter and eggis ar better meit,  
 And with ane plack to buy ane Messe,  
 Fra drunken Schir Jhone Latynless.'

The extortions of the clergy were notorious, but perhaps the most odious was that of the corpse-present. Canon law enacted that 'the most valuable animal of the deceased shall be paid to the Mother-Church for a mortuary.' This told heavily on the poor. If the bereaved household through poverty did not possess an animal, the 'uppermost' or largest and best cloth was taken. Sir David Lyndsay mercilessly satirises this imposition in a play performed before King James V. at Linlithgow in the year 1540. The poet tells of a worthy man who was reduced to poverty. He possessed a mare and three cows by which he supported his father, mother, wife and children. First the old father died, and the mother so mourned his loss that she died of grief, and then began a series of distresses. The grey mare was taken by the laird for his 'herezeld,' or casualty, on the death of his vassal, and the vicar took one cow for the father and another for the mother as his corpse-present. The wife grieved so sorely over their misfortune, that she 'deit for verie sorrow.' The vicar then reappeared on the scene and 'cleikit' the third cow, and his clerk went off with the uppermost cloth. Thus were this poor man and his bairns 'brocht into this miserie.' Sir David Lyndsay further alleges that the clergy would not allow the corpse to be carried beyond the kirk-style until sufficient security was given that the usual dues would be paid.

The 'cursings' of the clergy in those days had their ridiculous aspect. If an article had gone amissing, country folk, assuming it to be stolen, would go to the priest, and, paying a *plack*, request him to *curse* the

person who had appropriated it. Knox in his History, gives the following racy description of a friar at this work. 'The priest, whose duty and office it is to pray for the people, stands up on Sunday and cries—"Ane has tint a spurtell (lost a porridge stick); thair is a flail stoun beyond the burne; the gudewife on the other side of the gait has tint a horne spune; God's malison and mine I give to them that knows of this geir and restores it not."' There was a poet-priest at that time, of the name of Rowl, whose poultry-yard and garden had been robbed, and here is how he breaks out, calling on

' all the power under God  
And now of Rome that beiris the rod '

to injure the thieves.

' Black be their hour—black be their part,  
For five fat geese of Sir John Rowlis  
With capons, hens, and uthir fowlis,  
Baith the holders and concealers,  
Resettlers and the proved stealers,  
And he that sauls, seizes, and damns  
Beteich the devil, their guts and gammis  
Their tongues, their teeth, their hands, their feet,  
And all their body hail complete  
That brak his yaird and stole his frute.' <sup>1</sup>

But what more serious indictment of the clergy could there be than that which came from Archibald Hay in his *Panegyricus* addressed to Cardinal Beaton in 1540? Hay belonged to the old Church, was Principal of St Mary's College, St Andrews, and was one of the most scholarly and enlightened men in the kingdom at that

<sup>1</sup> From Laing's *Select Remains of the Ancient Popular Poetry of Scotland*.

time. Here is what he says to the Cardinal in his *epistola*, literally rendered from Latin into English :— ‘ I judge it to be intolerable that an entrance to the Church lies open to all without selection, and that some of the entrants bring with them utter ignorance, others a false pretence of knowledge, some a mind corrupted by the greatest sins and trained to commit all the most scandalous excesses, certain others a studied intention to do harm, so that there is no greater danger to be feared from the most noxious animals than from this offscouring of most abandoned men. . . . The Lord’s flock is starved with hunger.’ Were he to mention the awful sins ‘ which rage,’ he says, ‘ in the breasts of churchmen, no one would believe that monsters so savage lurked under a human countenance.’ If we make all allowance for strength of invective in those days, the terms of censure and condemnation, in this *epistola*, quite surpass the diatribes of Luther, Knox and many other militant Protestants, directed against the Romish Church. We have something almost equally strong in the narrative of the Jesuit, Nicola de Gouda, who was sent by the Pope as envoy to Queen Mary in 1562. He does not mince his words in describing the Scottish bishops and lesser clergy. ‘ They live but for themselves ’ Gouda asserts, ‘ their preachers are few in number, . . . the lives of the priests and clerics are scandalous and licentious,’ and there is ‘ absolutely supine negligence of the bishops.’ ‘ No wonder,’ he exclaims, ‘ that with such shepherds the wolves invade the flock of the Lord and ruin all.’

The nunneries at that time were very bad. In a petition, or report, of three Cardinals presented to Pope Paul IV. by Cardinal Sermoneta in the name of Queen Mary (then a girl in France) in 1556, we have this terrible passage : ‘ Moreover, on behalf of the said

Queen, it had been declared how all nunneries of every kind of religious women, and especially those of the Cistercian order, abbesses, prioresses, and sisters included, have come to such a pass of boldness, that they utterly condemn the safeguards of chastity. [For] not only do they wander outside the monastic enclosure in shameless fashion through the houses of seculars, but they even admit all sorts of worthless and wicked men within the convents, and hold with them unchaste intercourse. [Thus] they defile the sacred precincts with the birth of children, and bring up their progeny about them, go forth abroad surrounded by their numerous sons, and give their daughters in marriage endowered with the ample revenues of the Church.'

In much earlier days the faults of the Church were known to, and rebuked by, the Scottish Kings. James I. had warned the Benedictines against their besetting sin of indolence, and James V. was much displeased with the vices of the clergy. Publicly and privately the latter insisted on their reforming their lives, though in his case it was certainly like Satan rebuking sin,—reminding one, too, of a scene in *The Fortunes of Nigel*, when James VI. speaks of 'Steenie (the Duke of Buckingham) lecturing on the turpitude of incontinence.' The National Provincial Council which met in Edinburgh in 1559 took up the matter of greater efficiency and better morals in the Church, but, as naïvely remarks Bishop Leslie, the resolutions passed were such 'sharp statutes' that they formed 'the principal cause that a great number of young abbots, priors, deans and beneficed men assisted to the enterprise and practice devised for the overthrow of the Catholic religion.' Ninian Wingate, an apologist for the Remish faith, arraigns the clergy of his Church with a force and irony

unequalled by Knox himself, and denounces not only their corrupt lives, but 'their dumb doctrine in exalting ceremonies only . . . and far more their keeping in silence the true Word of God necessary to all men's salvation.' Pictures, images, mystery-plays and ceremonies were substituted for the circulation of the Bible, which the invention of printing had now made easy; and the Virgin Mary and saints departed were made to share in the office reserved for the One Mediator between God and man, the Lord Jesus Christ. With regard to the celebration of the Mass, it has been said, though with possible exaggeration, that the priest, holding the Host in his hands, might well be saying in the words of Judas, 'How much will ye give, that I will deliver Him unto you?' Knox and his followers may have spoken too strongly against corruptions and abuses connected with this sacred rite, but the words of Froude in his *History of England* (vol. vi. p. 221) may well be pondered over here. This rite, he says, was no longer with the Scottish people 'a mode of Christianity which serious persons could defend, but a Paphian idolatry identified with the coarsest forms of licentiousness. To plain eyes unjaundiced by theology it resembled too nearly the abominations of the Amorites or the accursed rites of Thammuz, and the northern reformers saw in their first study of the Old Testament the antitype of their own history. They construed literally the order to keep no terms with idol worship, and, in toleration or conformity, they found the rock on which the chosen people made shipwreck.' We have also Erasmus saying that 'the stupid monks say Mass as a cobbler makes a shoe; they come to the altar reeking from their filthy pleasures.'

Already we have referred to the Scottish nunneries. As regards the monasteries, the strictures on them by



the Scottish Reformers are serious enough, but they pale in severity compared with those of Romish dignitaries themselves, especially as regards some English religious houses, notably the Abbey of St Alban's. There still exists the letter penned by Cardinal-Archbishop Morton, in the reign of Henry VII., detailing the terrible vices prevailing there under Abbot William, who himself wallowed in mire and filth. It is indeed a hideous exposure, and no less so is that of the Abbey of Wigmore, near Ludlow, as revealed in the Memorial which stands to-day in the Rolls Collection. (Rolls House MS. *Miscellaneous Papers*, First Series.) A list still exists of more than twenty clergymen, in one diocese, who had obtained licences to keep concubines (see Tanner MS. 105, Bodleian Library, Oxford). Assuredly we would not say that all monasteries were as the two mentioned above, or that all clergymen were as those in that strange diocese, for there were the monks of the Charter House, London, who were virtuous, conscientious, brave and willing to suffer and die, and did suffer and die, for the old faith. But we desire to exonerate Knox and others of his Protestant contemporaries from strictures passed upon them for too severe condemnation of the old system.

As to the monasteries of Scotland being abodes of learning and diligent study, one has only to peruse the *Statuta* of the Provincial Council of 1549 to see that the reverse is the case, for on this and other points they directly contradict the assertions of Father Forbes Leith in his *Pre-Reformation Scholars in Scotland in the Sixteenth Century*.

Corruptions, abuses, and deficiencies, such as the above, we have introduced in order to show what John Knox had to preach against, and to explain in some measure his severe tone. Andrew Lang says that

Knox 'never knew the poetry and the mystic charm which the ceremonies and services of the Roman Church naturally awaken.' But we look in vain for 'poetry' or 'mystic charm' in the Scoto-Roman Church at the time of, and for many years before, the Reformation. That the services were conducted in a slovenly and irreverent manner there is abundant proof. In worship and in the administration of the Sacraments, a worthy dignity, an appealing grace, and the beauty of holiness, were lamentably absent. As for those who officiated at the altar, their lives were coarse, licentious, and shameless, as we have already seen. In short, the Church had failed, not only to make poetical and mystical her ceremonies and services, but to dispense those spiritual gifts which her Divine Head had committed to her. Decay had long ago set in, and her vigour and spirituality had been lost. Lord Morley has somewhere said that simplification is the keynote of the Reformation. What was artificial and conventional was thus pierced through to the natural man and natural life. We may indeed predicate this of every healthy revolution, where we find that movement is from the complex to the simple, from the technical to the vital, from the merely traditionary to the original springs. Palsied age gives way to the little child. Crises in nations, and in individuals, arise when of necessity we must get rid of exhausting encumbrances.

Knox felt that clouds of darkness had been hanging over the land, and he wanted the light of the sky to be no longer obscured. There was a veil of imposture which must be rent asunder, and God's sun be allowed to shine out once more. Ceremonial observances and what indeed was practically idolatry must cease, and the great and eternal spiritual truths, with resultant

integrity of heart and worthy conduct, must be insisted on. The inhabitants of Scotland must be told that faith in Jesus Christ—saving and sanctifying—was the one thing needful, and therefrom would come obedience to the divine voice, the keeping of the commandments, and the advancement of the nation in what was virtuous, lovely, and of good report. As day follows night, or as the plant and the flower rise from the seed, so would these things spring from a true and heartfelt acceptance of the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

As with nearly all in those days, Knox believed in, drew lessons from, portents—wonders in the heavens and upon the earth, such as a comet in the sky,<sup>1</sup> a great rainstorm suddenly changed into snow and ice, day turned into night by a prolonged darkness, extraordinary thunder and lightning, the sea seeming to stand still for twenty-four hours without ebb or flow, and even the birth of a calf with two heads. He interpreted, and applied, these portents as conveying warnings to the unrighteous and frivolous to ponder over their ways, and live more unto God and for the eternal things. As for his so-called ‘prophecies,’ they were simply the utterances of a man who saw far, knew men well, and had intimate, almost special, knowledge of affairs national and international.

Knox eagerly sought for earnest and duly qualified men who might create and maintain the religious life of the country by preaching the Word, reading the Scriptures, and catechising the people. By the year 1574 the parishes were supplied by two hundred and eighty-nine ministers, and seven hundred and fifteen ‘readers.’ By that time the ‘exhorters’ had dis-

<sup>1</sup> So Shakespeare in *Henry VI.*—‘Comets importing change of times and States.’

appeared, probably as being no longer required. Nor were the children neglected. There was a service every Sunday afternoon for them. It was mainly a catechising, and old people as well as young folk took part in it. Going forward to Holy Communion at an early age was not discouraged in those days. James Melville in his *Diary*, says:—‘Finally, I received the Communion of the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ first at Montrose, when I was in my thirteenth year, with greater reverence and sense in my soul than often thereafter I could find.’

Knox’s language was not vulgar, nor was his accent even distinctively Scottish. When he is speaking to us in his *History of the Reformation*—a book much of which is written speech—one is struck with the few purely Scottish words and idioms it contains, the probable explanation being his long residence on the Continent of Europe and in England, and his marrying into an English family. In one sentence of his writings, he seems almost to say that he liked England better than Scotland. He appears to have expressed himself in a kind of Anglicised Scots, and that is why Ninian Wingate said to him that as he had ‘forzet (forgotten) our auld plaine Scottis’ he would have to address him in Latin—‘for I am nocht,’ says Ninian, ‘acquaint with your Southeroun.’ Another of the old way taunted other preachers of the reform, and called them traitors, for ‘knapping suddrone,’ that is, clipping, speaking in the southern manner. When Knox preached at Ayr, some thought he was not a Scotsman at all. The report to the Queen Regent was as follows:—‘Divers men were of divers opinions, some affirming that it was an Englishman, and some supposing the contrary, but a prelate, not of the least pride, said, ‘Nay, no Englishman, but it is Knox, that knave.’

It has been said that as a *writer* of the old rich English tongue our Reformer has few equals, and no superior. His prose is stately and full of music. Avoiding pedantry and classical and scholastic terms, he is a writer for all times, intelligible in every age, with an attractive literary excellence.<sup>1</sup> In almost everything he wrote there is a touch of greatness. He sees events and the course of history with the divine purposes and judgments as their background. When he is at creed-making, as in the *Confessio Scotica*, he is stirred by the great truths of religion into lofty and tender utterance. The rhythm becomes stately, the diction noble, and we hear even a sound as of martial music. Edward Irving had great admiration for this Confession, and was wont, for a period, to read it twice a year to his London congregation. 'Its spirit,' he says, 'is large and liberal.'

Out of the pulpit, and in private, when he spoke, men listened eagerly to him. As with Robert Burns, there was something arresting and telling in his conversation. Of this gift or power of Knox's, a French Catholic said that 'he managed men's souls as he wished.' And here we may say that, though this great preacher and leader of the Reform may have pulled down much, he also built up much. He was a notable teacher of positive truth, and was, and is to-day, recognised as such by the Scottish people, and by many others. He certainly impressed himself upon the

<sup>1</sup> 'The writings of Knox were largely English, and his life shows how closely the Reformation drew the two nations and their speech together, with the inevitable result that Scotch gave way to English as the classical form of the language. Born and educated in the Scottish Lowlands, he married an English wife, nearly became an English bishop, and his two sons were educated in England, and became, one a fellow of St John's, Cambridge, the other a vicar in the Church of England.'—Professor Æ. J. G. Mackay, in his Introduction to Pitcottie's *Chronicles*.



nation. Robert Louis Stevenson has even said that he was 'the man who made Scotland over again in his own image.'

Sir David Wilkie painted a noble picture—unfinished, alas!—of Knox dispensing the Communion at Calder House. He limns well the great Reformer's features and expression. But in his other picture, Knox preaching at St Andrews—a masterpiece otherwise, though with some anachronisms—Wilkie has failed in his portraiture of the principal figure. There is nothing intellectual or powerful in the face there, and the gestures are rather those of a clown than of a great preacher. Even James Melville's pen-portrait will not save it, though the famous Scottish artist can scarcely have interpreted Melville's words as a certain French writer did, who said of Knox that, when he preached 'he bestirred himself like a madman; he broke his pulpit and jumped into the midst of his auditors (*sautait au milieu des auditeurs*), transported by his violent declamation, and words still more violent!' This would be written in all earnestness, and not facetiously as was the case with Mark Twain, who, in acknowledging a copy of Lord Guthrie's book *John Knox and His House*, thanked the donor 'for so much enlarging his knowledge of Knox, which previously had been confined to that discreditable incident when he threw a stool at Jenny Geddes and missed her.' Still much erroneous information is abroad with regard to John Knox, and we trust this volume will serve to correct a good many false impressions.

Our Reformer desired to, and did, popularise Church services. He wished the people to follow intelligently, and take part in them. Accordingly, he would have the Word read to them, and so far as possible by them, in their own tongue. Moreover, they must join in the



singing. Music had a very important place in the old church, and it had to be re-established, but differently, in the new. The praise must no longer be that only of clergy and choir, but also of the congregation. Knox and his coadjutors had a complete metrical psalter ready as early as 1564, and the people were carefully taught to sing these sacred songs. On one occasion two thousand people sang together the second version of the 124th Psalm to the very music to which it is sung to-day. What Longfellow calls the grand old Puritan anthem, 'All people that on earth do dwell,' was composed by William Kethe, a friend of Knox, and, with its stately old tune, survives all the changes of thought and fashion that the progress of four centuries has witnessed. The *Book of Discipline* declared that 'men, women, and children must be exhorted to exercise themselves, in the Psalms, that when the church convenes, and does sing, they may be the more able together with common heart and voice to praise God.' There is an old Scottish Psalter of 1566—still in manuscript—with which the Earl of Moray had a good deal to do, and it exhibits excellent musical taste. The Earl had his own views on the right adaptation of music to collective worship, was in touch with some of the more musical among the clergy of St Andrews, and with their aid carried through this book of praise. St Leonard's College always laid stress on music. It required of its entrants that they be acquainted with Gregorian song—'Cantuque Gregoriano sufficienter instructum'—and singing formed one of the regular exercises of the students. The religious of the Priory of St Andrews were particularly celebrated for their skill in music. Patrick Hamilton, who was specially associated with the younger canons of the Priory and the members of St Leonard's College, who were very

musical, set himself to improve the service of praise, and composed a chant in nine parts, which was sung in the Cathedral with great delight to the hearers. We know from contemporary references that in Glasgow and at Montrose church music was taught; and doubtless in many other places there would be weekly practisings, or such like, of Church praise.

Preparatory, however, to these Psalters and practisings was some fine vernacular poetry enshrined in the collections of 'Spiritual Sangis' and 'Gude and Godlie Ballatis' by the brothers James, John and Robert Wedderburn, which included 'the Psalmes of David with other new plesand Ballatis.' Circulated by printed sheets, and sung by wandering minstrels, they had become familiar to the people, and that they were very helpful to the cause of reform such verses as the following will show :—

' To pray to Peter, James and Johne  
Our saulis to saif, power haif they none,  
For that belongs to Christ alone,  
He deit thairfor, He deit thairfor.'

and—

' Of the fals fyre of Purgatorie  
Is nocht left in ane sponk ;  
Thairfor sayis Geddie woe is me,  
Gone is Priest, Freir, Monk ;  
The reik's (smoke) a wounder deir they solde  
For money, gold, and landis,  
Quhill half the ryches on the molde  
Is seasit in their handis.'

The artistic side of musical worship may not have appealed to Knox and his friends. There may have been no awakened outburst of song in Scotland as there was in Germany, and, hymnody being practically absent, there was no opportunity afforded for the

exercise of the musician's skill in free composition as was the case in the Lutheran Church. But the Scottish Church of the sixteenth century was far in advance of the Scottish Church about a century later, when no interest whatever was taken in sacred music by the authorities, and the singing in the churches was deplorable. The love and altruism of Christian ideals, of which we see so much in modern hymns, did not predominate in Reformation times, but rather men's minds were impressed with the grandeur, mystery, and power of God, and the battle-notes and rallying cries of the Church militant were sought for and employed. There is no evidence, indeed, that any collection of hymns was used in the Scottish Reformed Church for at least a decade after 1560. The Assembly of December 1564 ordained 'that everie minister, exhorter, and reader sall have one of the Psalmes bookes latelie printed in Edinburgh, and use the order conteaned therein, in prayer, marriage, and ministration of the Sacraments.' The said volume had nothing but the Psalms printed within it, though the same as published in Geneva had a few spiritual songs added. In the English edition of the same (1562), about twenty hymns accompany the Psalms.

As regards instrumental music in public worship, all that need be said is that Knox, when a Royal chaplain in England, and preaching before Edward VI., must have taken part in many services where organs were used, and that, in all his numerous writings, not a word is to be found in condemnation of them.

*2. He dispensed the Sacraments in a simple manner.*

Apart from individual cups, and other slight recent changes in some congregations, there cannot be much

difference between us moderns, throughout Presbyterian Christendom, and the followers of Knox in the sixteenth century, so far as the dispensation of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is concerned. A few miles from the author's manse in Ayrshire, stands the mansion-house of Gadgirth. Formerly an ancient castle stood on the site overlooking the Water of Ayr, and there is a tradition that Knox dispensed the Communion in that ancient stronghold. That he visited the place, there is no doubt, for he tells us in his History that 'he taught in the Barr, in the house of Carnell, in Kinzeancleuch, in the town of Ayr, and in the houses of Ochiltree and Gadgirth, and in some of them ministered the Lord's Table.' He seems to have been specially intimate with, and had a high opinion of, James Chalmers, the owner of that fair demesne. The family, originally named de la Chambre and of 'auld descent,' gave great help to Knox in the cause of reform. What more likely then than at Gadgirth he dispensed the Communion to a company of devoted Protestants? But there are other country houses where we know with certainty that Knox 'ministered the Lord's Table,' for he tells us so himself. At Finlayston, for instance, he dispensed the holy ordinance. He preached, and 'after doctrine' there followed the Communion, at which were present the Earl and Countess of Glencairn, two of their sons, and several friends of the family. The silver cups were carefully preserved, and the use of them was given at Communion times to the parish church of Kilmacolm, so long as the Glencairn family resided at their seat of Finlayston. At Dun too, in Forfarshire, the seat of John Erskine, the Lord's Supper was dispensed by Knox,—he, 'teiching them in greater liberty, the gentlemen required that he should ministrat likewise the Table of the Lord Jesus, whereof were

partakers the most part of the gentlemen of the Mearns.' One of Knox's earliest supporters and staunchest friends was Sir James Sandilands, one of whose sons was Preceptor of Torphichen, and head, in Scotland, of the religious order of military knights, who went by the name of Hospitallers of St John. The family were raised to the peerage about this time, their representative taking the title of Baron Torphichen. Sir James's home was Calder House, in Midlothian, and there Knox visited more than once. In the great hall there still hangs an ancient portrait of him. He would find congenial company in that abode for Sir James, who was now an old man—venerated for his grey hairs as well as for his valour, sagacity, and pure life—had long been a sincere friend of the reformed cause, and had contributed to its progress in the Lothians. Here, then, Knox administered the sacred rite, 'whare diverse from Edinburgh, and from the countrey about, convened, as weal for the doctrine as for the rycht use of the Lord's Table, which befor thei had never practised.' Three young noblemen were present who became prominent leaders in the nation's affairs, and gave valuable help on the Protestant side—Lord Erskine, who became Earl of Mar and Regent of the Kingdom; Lord Lorne, who became fifth Earl of Argyll; and Lord James Stewart, who became the Earl of Moray and 'The Good Regent.'

Thus, in a simple manner, very different from the Mass, was the Lord's Supper dispensed by our Reformer. We have no record of a Sacramental Sunday in St Giles', but the holy ordinance would doubtless be celebrated with simplicity and solemnity, as in the city of Geneva. All would understand what was said and done. It would be a Holy Feast. The effects were not *ex opere operato*, but by the working of the Spirit in those who



by faith received the elements. For a physical or carnal manducation there was now substituted a spiritual partaking of the body and blood of our Lord, such as an earlier and purer church had enjoined and practised. It should be remembered, however, that Knox and the other Scottish Protestant ministers held a high doctrine of the Sacrament. It dared not be dispensed by an unordained minister, and the *Confessio Scotica* says of it that 'in the Supper rightly used Christ Jesus is so joined to us, that He becomes the very nourishment and food of our souls . . . the faithful so do eat the body and drink the blood of the Lord Jesus . . . they are so made flesh of His flesh, and bone of His bone, that as the eternal Godhead hath given to the flesh of Jesus Christ . . . life and immortality, so doth Christ Jesus's flesh and blood eaten and drunken by us, give to us the same prerogatives.' While repudiating with vehemence the Romish doctrine of Transubstantiation, and any corporal or carnal blessing, the *Confessio* lays stress on 'the operation of the Holy Ghost, Who by true faith carries us above all things that are visible and carnal and earthly,' and so operates that 'albeit the faithful, oppressed by negligence and manly infirmity, doth not profit so much as they would at the very instant action of the Supper, yet it shall after bring forth fruit, as lively seed sown in good ground; for the Holy Spirit, which can never be divided from the right institution of the Lord Jesus, will not frustrate the faithful of the fruit of the mystical action.' Calvin's view was that 'no meeting of the Church be held without the dispensation of the Supper,' and that 'most assuredly the custom which prescribes Communion once a year is an invention of the devil.' Knox believed in and practised the frequency of Communion. From a rubric of the *Book*



*of Common Order and Directory for Public Worship*—his 'Liturgy'—it would appear to have been celebrated at first monthly. In 1562 it was ordered to be observed at least four times a year in the towns, and twice at least in country districts. This, however, meant much more than these stipulated celebrations, for there were often separate administrations on the same day, and these extended over several Sundays, as is still the practice in Holland.

It has been stated by Ninian Wingate—a contemporary Roman Catholic writer—that 'sum lordis and gentilmen' dispensed the Lord's Supper 'to their own household servands and tenants.' He adds, however, that 'Knox blamed the persons who did it, saying that they had "gretumlie (greatly) failzet."' We have seen no such disclaimer in any of Knox's writings, and Wingate does not cite any one instance in which the laity did this. He seems to have mixed up religious services—such as reading the Scriptures, exhortations, and prayers—with the dispensation of the Sacrament, for there were earnest, intelligent, and pious laymen who held services of that kind in their houses, when there was a great scarcity of ministers; but we have failed to detect any case where they also celebrated the Lord's Supper without a clergyman officiating.

During Knox's five years' residence in England, he had considerable influence on its Church, impressing his personality on the leaders in Church and State. He was 'licensed preacher' at Berwick and Newcastle, was chaplain to the Duke of Northumberland, and a royal chaplain. He had the refusal of the bishopric of Rochester, and also of the vicarage of All-Hallows, in Bread Street, London. His influence on the practice and creed of the Church of England was all towards simplicity. Kneeling at the Lord's Supper he held

was scripturally wrong. Calderwood tells us in his MS. History that when the Privy Council summoned Knox, and dealt with him, for refusing the London vicarage, he said he had great objections to kneeling at the Lord's Table, and the discussion ended characteristically. The Lords of the Council said 'they were sorry to know him of a contrary mind to the Common Order, but he answered that he was more sorry that a Common Order should be contrary to Christ's institution.' The *Second Prayer Book of Edward VI.* was ready for publication, with the rubric giving its sanction to the kneeling posture. Knox took exception to it; Ridley and Peter Martyr supported him; the printing of the book was stopped; a note was appended in which it was stated that in kneeling no adoration was intended; and in subsequent issues this declaration formed part of the text, and was henceforth called by some the 'Black Rubric.'<sup>1</sup> As regards the Thirty-Nine Articles, Knox, as royal chaplain, took part in their revision. One of these articles stated that the ceremonies enjoined were in accordance with evangelical liberty. Knox denied that, and his persistent opposition (for kneeling at the Lord's Supper would again have been approved) resulted in the obnoxious clause being omitted. Simplicity—'no leavings of popish dregs'—he always insisted on and practised.

We have no account of Knox's administering the Sacrament of Baptism, but it would also be done simply, and in a manner easily understood by the people. In Book V. of his History, there is an account of the

<sup>1</sup> There is nothing sinister in the adjective, the designation 'Black Rubric' being simply used to distinguish it from the 'Red Rubric,' red in printing then being equivalent to italics now. In 1559 the 'Black Rubric' was dropped, doubtless to please the young Queen Elizabeth, but in 1661 it was restored.

baptism of Queen Mary's son, Prince James, at Stirling, and though that part of the History cannot be proved to be by Knox, it is a kindred spirit who describes the administration of the Sacrament on that occasion. He says it was done with great pomp in the Romish fashion, the Archbishop of St Andrews officiating, and nobles (with reluctance, however), bearing the 'salt, grease, and candle,' used in connection with the rite. Knox abolished such accessories—the use of 'oyle, salt, wax, spittall, conjuration or croceing'—but he held a high doctrine with regard to this ordinance also. As with the bread and wine in the Supper, the water in Baptism was anything but a 'naked and bare sign.' These elements or symbols did 'seal in their [the participants'] hearts the assurance of His promise, and of that most blessed conjunction, union, and society, which the elect have with their Head, Christ Jesus.' Baptism, according to Knox, was only to be administered by a duly qualified minister, and the rite 'appertaineth as well to the infants of the faithful as to those that be of age and discretion.' Before either Sacrament was administered the minister was to instruct the people plainly, remind them of God's free grace and mercy offered to the penitent in Christ Jesus, rehearse the promises of God, and declare the end and use of the Sacraments in the language of the people that all may understand, and add nothing or substract nothing, but do all according to the institution of the Lord Jesus, and the practice of His holy Apostles. It may be added that in 'Knox's Liturgy' it is said that 'the infant that is to be baptized shall be brought to the Church on the day appointed to Common Prayer and Preaching,' and, as a matter of fact, the Church at first was so strict with regard to this that a minister of Tranent was suspended, and obliged to repent publicly,

for baptizing children in private houses. It may be further stated that in 1565 the General Assembly acknowledged the validity of Romish baptism, and ordered that it was not to be repeated. In this connection it may not be generally known that Calvin's view was that, in case of necessity, parents should bring their children to Romish priests for baptism rather than suffer them to remain unbaptized, as to neglect or despise the ordinance seemed like contempt for Christianity itself. Knox would have the faithful, in the absence of ministers, edify and confirm one another in the faith. He laid great stress on religion in the home. His view was that in their households men were 'bishops and kings' and 'their wives, children, servants and family their bishopric and their charge.' He drew up instructions and helps for such family worship.

Let a sentence be added here with regard to the so-called 'Liturgy' of John Knox. In the year 1557 the Lords of the Congregation adopted the *Second Prayer Book of Edward VI.*, in the preparation of which Knox himself assisted. Soon after its issue, however, Knox proceeded to the Continent, where he adopted the Prayer Book of the French Reformed (Huguenot) Church for the use of the congregation of English refugees at Frankfort, and it was this manual, known for a time as the 'Book of Geneva,' that came to be styled 'John Knox's Liturgy.'

We may say that, in a sense, our Reformer was not a revolutionary as regards church doctrine and practice. The Protestants, with him, did not advance opinions unheard of before. His view would be that of Calvin as we have it in the *Institutes*: 'The Reformation does not invent new opinions; it only strips off the falsehood, and makes plain old truths.' The greatness of Knox

did not lie so much in his intrepidity and firmness in attacking the errors and corruptions which had demoralised the church and society, as in his efforts to build up, and in his success in building up, a reformed church and a reformed society.

Professor Moffat records that he once heard an Anglican High Churchman speak contemptuously of 'Reformation.' 'You can talk of a reformed drunkard,' he sneered, 'but how can you talk of a reformed Church?' 'You can,' said Dr Moffat, 'and if you are to be true to history, you must. At the time of Knox the supreme religious interests of the Gospel demanded such a reformation or reorganisation.'

The Scottish Reformers did not abolish the ancient Church, and they did not found a new one. It was a policy of reform to which the Scottish Parliament gave effect, a *reform* which earlier had been advocated by Alane (Alesius) and others. We do not think the word Protestant is used in the Acts of Parliament, for there were not to be two Churches, one Protestant and the other Roman Catholic. Such a thing was unthinkable to Knox and his coadjutors. As Professor Robert Lee has truly observed: 'It is a remarkable fact, and may appear to us unaccountable, that they all, or nearly all, agreed with the Catholics in holding that for two Churches to co-exist in the same country was monstrous, and even impossible, as much as for two States to co-exist, and that such schism was at all hazards to be repressed.' (*Life*, II. p. 301).

Knox wished religion to be sincere, pure, and undefiled—of the kind of which Carlyle, in speaking of Puritanism, says that it was 'a faith or religion which came forth as a real business of the heart.' This applied to Knox's idea of worship—it must be from, and of, the heart, and therefore he was ever suspicious of, and



antagonistic to, postures and posturing. We may say, then, that as the Reformation gave to the people the Bible in their own tongue, so also it restored the Eucharist from the elaborate mystery of the Mass, and Baptism from its strange accessories, to the affecting simplicity of the Lord's Supper and the solemn sprinkling of water. As all were to understand what the sacred rites meant, heads of households were exhorted to cause their dependants to be instructed in the faith, and weekly meetings were ordered to be held in the churches for the opening up of the Scriptures.

It may be observed here that Knox was ahead of many then as regards his views on the Bible, and the way in which he handled the sacred oracles. We might almost say he was a true modern in these respects. Historical criticism—higher or lower—had not come into existence, nor had any question been raised touching the Canon. With Protestants—both in the Scottish and the English Churches—as with Romanists, the Bible was regarded as unreservedly true, and its contents received as the oracles of God. But the book was no fetish to Knox and his fellow-reformers. Assuredly they would not have said what was said in after days, that the Bible was the religion of Protestants. They had no superstitious or magical theory with regard to its origin or preservation. They did not dogmatise concerning it, nor did they obscure its great realities with gratuitous assumptions of their own. In their Confession of Faith they declared that the interpretation of Holy Scripture appertained neither to private nor public persons, nor to any Church or Council, but to 'the Spirit of God by the which also the Scripture was written.' Knox appealed from the Church to the Bible. He laid stress on its 'Thus saith the Lord.' His creed was not the light that illumined or interpreted



the Scriptures, but for him it was the Scriptures which illumined and interpreted his creed ; and the reformed Church was only the ground and pillar of the truth in so far as it listened to the Incarnate Word speaking in the sacred writings. Knox found its words speak to the times. It was a very living Book to him. No warnings, no exhortations, no trumpet-calls were so completely suited to Scotland for the work of reform as those contained in the divine writings. And in modern times are we not learning the same thing, and using that Book now as the reformers used it ? Knox and his friends had a stronger and far more practical belief in the Bible than the old Church had, and they used it as a fan to blow away the chaff and thoroughly purge the floor of the Church. It was a tool to them wherewith to build up the City of God in the land.

Though the Scottish Church owes a very great deal to John Calvin, his influence on it is apt to be exaggerated. The Scottish people of the Reform did not call him master. Their Church was to have a scriptural basis, not necessarily a Genevan one. It was certainly to have nothing provincial about it. When George Buchanan returned to Scotland in 1561 he did not say that he now belonged to the Church of Calvin, or of Knox, or to a Presbyterian Church, or even to a Protestant Church. He 'gave in his name to the Church of the Scots.' He speaks of the 'Lutheran sect,' but never of the 'Knoxian,' or Scottish, sect. Nor was it from Geneva that our Church got the order of 'elders.' Professor MacEwen, in his History, points out that the French Reformed Church had not a single organised congregation till 1555, and that there was no connection between Scottish and French Protestants then ; that Calvin's elders were unlike Knox's, both in method of appointment and in authority exercised ;

that it was in those Scottish east coast towns where the spirit of freedom was most developed that 'sessions,' or boards of elders, were first organised; and, indeed, that it was not upon the ecclesiastical theories of Calvin the large responsibilities of local authorities were founded, but in an indigenous development to be found in burgh trade organisations, and the like, in Scotland before and contemporary with the Reformation. But, after all, it was a Biblical and not a foreign or native sanction and security that the Scottish reformers desired for their Church. As John Row *secundus*, the son of one who drew up the *Confession* of 1560 and the *First Book of Discipline*, says, 'the ministers that were, took not their pattern from any Kirk in the world, no, not from Geneva itself; but laying God's Word before them made reformation according thereunto both in doctrine first, and then in discipline when and as they might get it overtaken.'

A word may here be said about Knox and Sunday observance. He certainly was not a Sabbatarian, as many in Scotland were half a century ago. The Lord's Day was to be 'straightly kept,' but we do not find that particular emphasis laid on the Fourth Commandment which was noticeable later north of the Tweed. On Sunday Knox himself wrote letters, made journeys, and entertained guests of high standing. It may be further stated that at the time the *Confession of Faith* and *Book of Discipline* were drawn up, the first day of the week was still known by its ancient name, the new title of Sabbath coming in later.

### 3. *He Fought for the Freedom of the Church*

The scene is well known when, at one of the early meetings of the General Assembly, Maitland of Lethington

challenged the right of any such Assembly<sup>1</sup> to sit. What was its authority? 'Has the Queen allowed such conventions?' he demanded. That for him was the all-important question. From Knox<sup>1</sup> came at once the reply, 'If the liberty of the Kirk should depend on the Queen's allowance or disallowance, we are afraid we shall be deprived not only of Assemblies, but of the public preaching of the Gospel.' 'No such thing,' exclaimed Maitland. 'Well,' said Knox, 'time will try; but I will add, take from us the freedom of Assemblies and take from us the Evangel.' Thus at the very outset our Reformer contended for the freedom of the Church. The Assembly—the Church's supreme court—met on its own authority. Jesus Christ alone was its Head and Governor. By His authority—and guided by His Spirit—it would meet and deliberate and legislate on matters pertaining to His Kingdom. No earthly sovereign could intervene, or interfere with it, so long as it kept within its own jurisdiction. Some years after Knox's death, the ministers opposed James VI. when he endeavoured to force his episcopacy and his absolutism upon them. They may have urged extreme claims as regards the relations of Church and State, but they did so because this monarch was assuming powers, and exercising them by open policy and secret intrigue, which were of an unprecedented and dangerous kind. Dr Hume Brown in his *History of Scotland* puts the matter in this way: 'In the twofold dread of Rome and the "bloody guillie (large knife) of absolute authority" (Andrew Melville's famous phrases), Presbyterianism came to birth in Scotland, and took the

<sup>1</sup> These replies are invariably quoted as made by Knox. He does not himself say in his *History* that he is the speaker; but there can be no reasonable doubt that it was he, the writer of the history, and the maker of the history, of those times from whom such memorable replies came.

stern lineaments with which the world is familiar. Calvinism, by the characters which it formed, saved Protestantism in Europe; and with equal truth it may be said that Presbyterianism saved Scotland.' The divine right of Presbytery in conflict with the divine right of Kings was a strange but necessary battle. In the end, it might be said that neither side won, for the Revolution Settlement of 1688 put an end to both claims; but no one surely will deny that it was the divine right of Presbyters—or call it the brave stand made by generations of the followers of John Knox—that brought on that revolution and made the settlement which followed possible.

Still, there was a breadth in the Church of John Knox which we see lacking in later days. His mind, it should be remembered, was made up on all the great questions of the time before he even saw Calvin, and in some respects he was ahead of the great Reformer of Geneva. Andrew Melville rather narrowed the Church—and perhaps it was necessary then to narrow the issue in its conflict with King James. But in Knox's time we perceive a broad outlook—it was 'the universal Kirk' in sympathy with every reformed Church in Europe, and desirous more particularly of being on good terms with the Church of England. There are those who affirm that Knox's Church was, and could only be, a narrow Church. Among such is Mr William Law Mathieson, who, in his *Politics and Religion in Scotland*, says: 'The Reformed Church, which took shape in August 1561, was an institution so exceedingly limited in scope, that it could accommodate—at all events with comfort—only a very small minority. . . . Knox, in fact, was the first dissenter, abjuring and protesting at every stage of the Church's history. This, of course, was as far as possible from the end which he

himself had in view. Indeed, the strongest proof of Knox's failure as an ecclesiastical statesman is the signal contrast between the permanence of his spirit and the barrenness of his ideas. . . . Whatever it might be in form—and it was not till the eighteenth century that dissent could be openly avowed—the Knoxian Church was essentially the Church of the minority ; and thus we are confronted with the singular paradox that the man whose ideal was a theocracy, a *Civitas Dei*, has become a parent of schism, the father of Scottish dissent.' Now, it is true that there have been many protests, dissents, schisms in the Scottish Church—a proof perhaps of the Scotsman's tendency to think for himself and his jealousy of any encroachments on his liberty. The Scot has always had a dread of servility and formalism, but, after all, divisions have not weakened the Scottish Church as a whole. It has grown by its virile offshoots, with the result that, apart from increase to the population by immigrants, notably Roman Catholics from Ireland, Scotland is predominantly Presbyterian—in other words, belongs to the church of John Knox. But the scattered elements have been gradually coming together, with the result that to-day the great majority of the Scottish people belong either to the *Established* Church of Scotland or to the *United Free* Church of Scotland ; and there is every indication that these two great Churches will soon unite. Nor can any one doubt the scholarship, the width of sympathy, and the home and foreign mission enterprise, of these two Churches. And is there any other country where the Church has such a strong popular basis, and where a churchly feeling is so much in evidence ? Moreover, this church of Knox has spread to the very ends of the earth—is by no means ' the Church of a minority '—and is one of the largest denominations or churches in Protestant



Christendom. Look at its branches, or offspring, in Ireland, Wales, and England ; in the British Colonies and Dependencies ; and in the United States of America. Of that last great country, the President, Woodrow Wilson, is a Presbyterian, and for some years was head of a notable Presbyterian institution. There may be at present a re-action against him—his break-down in health has given his enemies much advantage—but it will surely never be forgotten that he brought America to the side of Britain and its Allies in the Great War, and that his insistence on the League of Nations strongly influenced the formation of the Peace Treaty. It is related that, after one of the episodes at Versailles, in which Mr Wilson had opposed unlimited indemnities, M. Clemenceau seizing his hand exclaimed, ‘ Mr President, you are not only a good man ; you are a great man, and you are right.’

There was another Head or President of the above-mentioned institution—Princeton College, New Jersey—who more than a century earlier, had great influence on the affairs of the American people. He was great grand-uncle of Woodrow Wilson. This was the Presbyterian minister Dr John Witherspoon, a lineal descendant of John Knox (through his daughter who became the wife of John Welsh of Ayr), and born like his great ancestor near Haddington. He, after being parish minister at Beith, and then at Paisley, accepted an invitation from America to fill an important post there. Because of his attainments, and doubtless also because of his noble presence (in majesty of bearing he was said to be second only to George Washington), he was received with great enthusiasm on his arrival in New England, and his journey from Philadelphia to Princeton was a triumphal procession. He soon became a member of the General Congress by which the Constitution of

the United States was framed, was a member of the most important Government committees, was one of those who signed the Declaration of Independence ; and there came from his professorial class-room many of the early patriots and legislators of the United States of America, among them James Madison.

President Wilson is an elder of the Presbyterian Church, and so too are Vice-President Marshall, Secretary of State Lansing, and other members of the United States Government. The Secretary of the U.S.A. Navy is also a Presbyterian. The recent British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Mr Balfour, who went across to America, and by his words and deeds cemented closely the two nations, also belongs to that Church which Mr Law Mathieson deems narrow and disruptive. By baptism, upbringing, and conviction, there belongs to it also the British Commander-in-Chief, Earl Haig of Bemersyde ; the hero of the Marne, too, Cesaire Joffre, Marshal of France, is a member of the French Church of that persuasion ; and the Leader of the House of Commons in the war days, Mr Bonar Law, is a sturdy Presbyterian. Still, with all its past noble history and present day *éclat*, it should be remembered that Presbytery or Presbyterianism was not a watch-word of John Knox's. It was not a battle cry or rallying ground. Almost automatically the Scottish people became Presbyterian, for the system commended itself to that freedom-loving nation. A good working system, held to possess New Testament sanction, it cut away the false notion that the Church was made up of the clergy or ministers, and that priests must needs come between the Christian and Christ. To the mind of the Scottish people, the Church as Presbyterian preserved a fundamental principle of the New Testament, and was in the spirit

of that Book. And so by this system, or channel, they carried on the faith once delivered to the saints. As Principal Rainy, in his reply to Dean Stanley, said, 'Presbyterianism is a system for a free people, that love a regulated and self-respecting freedom. . . . It is a system for strong churches—churches that are not afraid to let their matters see the light of day—to let their weakest parts and their worst defects be canvassed before all men that they may be mended. . . . It is a system for Catholic Christians, who wish not merely to cherish private idiosyncrasies, but to feel themselves identified with the common cause, while they cleave directly to Him whose cause it is.'

Matthew Arnold says that 'Presbyterianism is born to division as the sparks fly upward.' But the historian must admit that, for the most part, it has been something extraneous to Presbyterianism that has caused so much strife and disunion, namely the civil power, with its civil magistrate, as we see such busy at work in the reigns of the last Stewart Kings; in the days of Queen Anne when the obnoxious Patronage Act was passed; and later in the era of Burgess Oaths; and still later, when the State, or its Courts, so encroached on the Church as to cause the Disruption of 1843.

Then, though there be external divisions among Presbyterians, yet there is wonderful unity in the Presbyterian Church as a whole, perhaps more than in the Protestant Episcopal Church, which has its sections and parties strongly opposed to each other; perhaps more than in the Church of Rome, which at its very centre—the Vatican—has its strifes and factions; and even, perhaps, more than in the Eastern Church, which outwardly stands—at any rate, till recently did stand—for all that is stagnant, unchanging, and unvarying. Far from being local or provincial, Presbyterianism is

represented in nearly all the countries of the world, having thirty million souls within its pale, and nearly one hundred million within the care of its churches; for in Scotland and elsewhere it carries imperial responsibilities, and not only ministers to its own people at home and in the Colonies, but has spread missions over India, China, Africa, and the Islands of the Sea. It sends some of its best men and women as preachers, teachers, and physicians to those regions beyond. There is a 'divine right of Presbytery'—not to be the only Church, or to unchurch others, but to be what it is and do what it does. Flexible and adaptable, perhaps there is no system so ready to co-operate with others in the common service of the Kingdom of God. Well does the present writer remember when, at the induction services of a brother Presbyterian in a certain English town, the Venerable Archdeacon of the diocese kindly graced the proceedings with his presence; but in his speech the good man said that while he welcomed cordially Mr —— to the town, and hoped to be associated with him in work for the betterment of the community, he regretted that, of course, he and Mr —— could not at any time occupy each other's pulpits. We whispered to our friend, 'In your reply at the close, say you could at any time have the Archdeacon in your pulpit, and would be delighted to see him there, but it was not your fault that you could not occupy the Archdeacon's.' And so Mr —— made answer in all courtesy. This was some years ago, but we are glad that the Anglican Church has moved since then, and we await with much interest the result of discussions at Lambeth and other Conferences.

To the Pan-, General, or Catholic Presbyterian Council delegates come from all parts of the world. It was a universal, not provincial, Kirk of which Knox

was a member and leader ; but, while he laid stress on its universality, he also laid stress on its antiquity. ' We therefore say,' he exclaims, ' that our Kirk is no new-found Kirk . . . but that it is part of that holy Kirk universal, which is grounded upon the doctrine of the Prophets and Apostles, having the same antiquity that the Kirk of the Apostles has, as concerning doctrine, prayers, administration of the Sacrament, and all other things, requisite to a particular Kirk.' Indeed, his view is that the new Church with no real antiquity is the Romish Church. ' Wheresoever,' he says, ' the Papists and we shall come to reckon on the age of our faith, we doubt nothing but that their faith, in more principal points nor one or two, shall be found very young, and but lately invented in respect of that only true faith, which this day in the Kirks of Scotland is preferred ' (*Works*, vol. vi. 492). Ours, he would say, is a historical Church, springing from an ancient apostolic base, free from later injurious growths, and consciously allied with the purity, strength, and joy of its youth.

Calvinistic this Church may be designated, but not so by Knox. It has never taken to itself any human name—nor, with Knox, even the designation Presbyterian—but with him it is the Catholic Reformed Church. Quite independently of the great Reformer of Geneva—before they had ever met—the great Reformer of Scotland had arrived at similar conclusions regarding Protestantism, both deriving them from the same source, Holy Scripture. Nor is the theology of this Church narrow. Already we have spoken of that, but here let us add what the late Professor Hastie, of Glasgow University, has said on the subject. This scholar and thinker had great delight in showing—or endeavouring to show—that the Scottish Reformed



theology was much superior to all other forms of theology, whether Romish, Lutheran, Anglican, Arminian, Socinian, or other. He held, in fact, that it was the only theology with which we could face, with the hope of complete conquest, all the spiritual dangers and terrors of our time ; deep and large enough and divine enough, rightly understood, to confront them and do battle with them all in vindication of the Creator, Preserver and Governor of the Worlds, and of the Justice and Love of the Divine Personality.<sup>1</sup> For Knox the Reformed Church meant what it means for us to-day, namely, a Church holding the Faith once delivered to the saints, holding the tradition unbroken of the Primitive Church, and holding, and ever endeavouring to realise, the ideal of the eternal City of God.

It is of some significance that in several Scottish documents, of the time immediately after the great events of 1555-1560, the Reformed Church of Scotland is referred to as ' Holy Kirk,' a designation long applied to the Church of Rome. It should be noted, moreover, that in the Articles, submitted as a basis for Union by the Committee of the Church of Scotland to the General Assembly in 1918, it is stated on the very front that ' the Church of Scotland is part of the Holy Catholic or Universal Church . . . in historic continuity with the Church of Scotland which was reformed in 1560,' and ' is part of the Universal Church wherein the Lord Jesus Christ has appointed a government in the hands of Church office-bearers,' etc.

And who are among the great theologians and interpreters of Scripture to-day in the English-speaking world ? Theological Catalogues or Publishers' Lists

<sup>1</sup> See Dr Hastie's Croall Lecture, *The Theology of the Reformed Church in its Fundamental Principles*.

would seem to indicate that it is the professors and ministers of the Scottish and allied Churches—the Churches which acknowledge and reverence the name of Knox as their great father and founder—who occupy the front ranks, or at least are not far therefrom.

These strictures, then, on Mr Mathieson's statement will surely show that the Reformed Church in Scotland, which took shape in 1561, was not, is not in the present age, and will not be in the coming days, a small, narrow, and unenlightened Church. What Carlyle said eighty years ago in his Lectures on *Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic in History*, has had considerable support added to it in the intervening years: 'Knox was Chief Priest and Founder of the Faith that became Scotland's, New England's, Oliver Cromwell's. History will have something to say about this for some time to come. . . . It got itself established as a Presbyterianism, and has produced in the world very notable fruit.'

It may be said here that the relations between the Churches of England and Scotland in the early days of the Reformation, and for some time after, were friendly, and there was considerable intercourse between them. The Church of England was then not only in sympathy but in communion with the Reformed Churches everywhere. It was later that the Divine Right of Episcopacy and the Divine Right of Presbytery, respectively, were asserted. Bishop Bancroft was the first to declare the former in his famous sermons at Paul's Cross in 1589, and Andrew Melville, in defence, contended for the latter. Archbishop Laud, in later years, further aired the claims of Anglicanism, and the Scots ministers had to assert the contrary and claim for their *ism* still higher things. But in Knox's time there was no such high-flying, and the Scottish preachers, with orders genuine but not hierarchical, were freely recommended

and cordially welcomed by the English Church to its ministry, and even to its highest offices.

While Luther's reformation had mainly to do with doctrine, and his watchword and rallying cry was *Justification by Faith*, and the removal of all doctrines, dogmas, and practices incompatible therewith, or injurious to it, Knox was above all things a *Church* reformer. He said that was his work. Accordingly, as we have stated under our second head, the movements led by him were for purity and simplicity in worship. Image-worship, and all else akin, he contended must be swept away. But he, along with his fellow-reformers, gave great power to the secular arm. It was a sacred principle with them that kings and magistrates were appointed not only for civil policy, but for the upholding and furthering of religion. They could not have held otherwise, for it was inconceivable to them that Church and State could be at variance. Popery, with its canon law, had been strangling the national life, and, from such entanglement and incubus, the civil power must give deliverance. Church and State should work harmoniously for the good of the country. There were two jurisdictions, but they need not encroach on each other. Knox never desired that the Church should be above the civil power, or have contendings with it at all. He wished the one to help the other. In pre-Reformation times, the separate jurisdiction of the civil and the ecclesiastical authorities had been to a great extent lost sight of. In Scotland as elsewhere, the chief offices were held by churchmen, and the Church determined all civil causes. In the great stained-glass window of the Parliament House, Edinburgh, it will be noticed that James V. is represented as seated on the throne of Scotland, and is handing the Papal Bull, instituting the Court of Session, to Abbot Alexander

Mylne, first President thereof, while the Archbishop of Glasgow, Chancellor of Scotland, is standing among the nobles in a prominent position expressing his approval of these important legal proceedings.

Though, for a few years after the Reformation, the Scottish ministers were consulted by the Lords of the Congregation, and had often to act as political advisers—some of them even sitting as judges in the Court of Session—it was simply because there were no others qualified by training and experience whom the nation could obtain for such purposes. But the Reformers considered such employment for their ministers as undesirable and indeed wrong, and, as soon as they could, insisted on the separation of the two jurisdictions, and condemned all words and deeds that might obliterate or confuse the distinction.

There was nothing priestly in Knox's claim, or in the doings of this Reformed Church of Scotland. The laity predominated in the early Assemblies, the first consisting of only six ministers, the other members being thirty-six laymen. And Knox would not have the meetings of the Assembly in secret. If the Queen had any suspicion of them, they would be quite willing to have a representative of the Crown present to hear their deliberations; but no such representative or commissioner could constitute or dissolve the Assembly. The genius of the Scottish people has always been totally opposed to anything like Hildebrandism. Their Church has been, and is, perhaps the most democratic on the face of the earth, with abundant opportunity for the voice and practical energy of the laity. Independency or Congregationalism may seem more democratic, but in that system cohesion and government are lacking. The Scottish, that is the Presbyterian, Church is a government of the people by the people.

Knox gave liberty to the congregation. 'He attached the greatest importance to the Lord's people assembled together. In the *First Book of Discipline*, which he had so large a hand in framing, the election of the minister is vested in the people, though there might be special cases, through delays or negligence on the part of the congregation, where 'the Church of the Superintendent with his counsell' or 'the counsell or greater Church,' could make the presentation. But Church Courts, or any other body, were not to draw patronage to themselves. The two *Books of Discipline* ring with protests against infringement of a congregation's liberty. Emphatically says the First Book—and undoubtedly John Knox speaks in the words—'The presentation of the Pepil . . . must be preferred. . . . Altogether this is to be avoided, that any may be violentlie intruded or thrust upon any Congregation. But this libertie with all cair must be reserved till everie severall Kirk.' In this Book, as in its successor, we have the principles, and aids towards the practice, of a church polity which is for strong men, and a freedom-loving people will rejoice in it. It is of some significance that Knox's own election at St Andrews, irregular though it may have been, was the first occasion in Scotland when the congregation claimed to choose its spiritual guide.

Allied to, and springing from, or perhaps rather contributing to, the freedom of the Church is the freedom of the individual member of the Church. Knox laid great stress on this latter. Before his time in Scotland, the individual, as Church member, could only approach God by submitting to regulations laid down by an infallible Church, which Church said that the approach must be through officials—the priests—of the Church. But Knox would acknowledge no such regulations and claims. His view was—and he never ceased to give it



the greatest emphasis—that the individual man has the right and the duty to approach God, and receive grace, apart from any ecclesiastical channel. With him there was only one Mediator between God and Man—and that was our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ—and His will was revealed to us by the Holy Spirit through the Holy Scriptures. We could trust Jesus Christ with all we have been, all we are, and all that we hope to be. This Saviour would carry all, and carry us through all. He is the Saviour from every sin, our eternal salvation, and our soul's help in to-day's and the next day's difficulties.

Undoubtedly great power is exercised by the courts of such a Church, a power which many an Anglican Bishop may well envy; but the laity are greatly in the majority in these courts—in the Kirk-Session it may be in the proportion of twenty (or, indeed, many more) to one; in the Presbytery for every clergyman there is a layman, sometimes two (as in the United Free Church of Scotland, for every congregation whose membership exceeds four hundred); in the Provincial Synod the same proportion pertains; and in the General Assembly ministers and laymen sit and vote in equal numbers.

Yet, probably, Ian Maclaren is right when, in one of his stories, he says that if the most pious and intelligent elder (lay) dared to administer a Sacrament, he would be at once tried and censured for sacrilege. It should not be forgotten that, differing from the French and Swiss Churches, the General Assembly was the first court that was constituted, and that the second was not the Provincial Synod, nor the Presbytery, but the Kirk-Session. Indeed, the Presbytery, which gives its name to the church of Knox, was the last of all to be instituted. So we have, first of all, the General Assembly, vindicating the independence and liberty

of the Church, and then the Kirk-Session regulating the religious life by its firm and salutary discipline. It was twenty years after the Reformation before Presbyteries were formed, or at least became part of the established polity of the Church.

For many years there was practically no government in rural districts, but that of the Kirk-Session. It had to take cognisance of many matters now, and rightly, relegated to civil authorities. The poor, for instance, the education of the people, and the reform of drunkards, fell to be dealt with by this court of the Church. Indeed, when the Presbyterian Church was in its infancy in Scotland, the people seem to have expected far more from it than from Parliament. They certainly had exalted ideas of their early General Assemblies, as the following incident will show. There was a want of uniformity as regards the weights and measures used in 'burgh and land,' and a great grievance resulted. The burgh merchants had 'ane wecht to buy with, and ane other to sell with different in wecht therefrom,' which greatly provoked those living in country districts. Certain of the aggrieved parties, nothing doubting that the men whom God had sent to preach His truth in the land would right such a wrong, brought the injustice before a meeting of the General Assembly, praying them to take order with the evil-doers who made the ephal small and the shekel great. The Assembly held that the matter was not for them, and referred the petition to the proper court. We find also that the Presbytery of St Andrews over-  
tured the Synod regarding the unsatisfactory state of bridges within its bounds; the Presbytery of Lanark called upon the Earl of Angus to hasten on with the building of a certain bridge over the Clyde; the same Presbytery ordained Lord Douglas to make reparation

to injured and oppressed tenants ; the Kirk-Session of Humble, when a plague was raging, forbade communications with infected localities ; and a citizen of Perth complained to the Kirk-Session that his neighbour below had a fire but no chimney, and had thus rendered himself a nuisance, and the said Session forbade the man lighting any more fires till he had procured a chimney.

Knox and his fellow-labourers were social reformers, as is quite apparent from the *Book of Discipline*. Their views on sanitation were far ahead of their times. Look, for instance, at what that Book says about cemeteries. It condemns burial in churches 'in respect of diverse inconvenientis,' and suggests that a 'secret (*i.e.* sequestered) and convenient place, lying in the most free air, be appointed for that use ; the which place ought to be well walled and fenced about, and kept for that use onlie.' When we take along with this the injunction of the General Assembly in 1563, that the dead should be buried 'saxe foote under the eird,' it is evident that our Scottish Reformers held advanced views on sanitary matters.

We know how, in later days, the satire of Robert Burns, and the adverse criticism of some other writers, have drawn attention to what seems a tyrannical and pharisaic spirit in Kirk-Session records. But what Knox and the compilers of the *Book of Discipline* had in view was the stemming of a strong tide of licentiousness then prevailing, and the aiding of the law of the land in putting down crime ; for the civil law was certainly weak and men's passions were strong. Heresy and the breach of Church customs, ceremonies, and rites, are not much in evidence in these records, but adultery, fornication, drunkenness are mentioned with great frequency. Moreover, the Session and the

superior courts acted slowly ; gave many opportunities for repentance ; and upon ministers and elders, as well as ordinary members, its censures and punishments fell. Ministers, indeed, when they lapsed were punished with special severity, as witness the case of Paul Methven, who was deposed for committing adultery with his servant, and was only offered restoration to the office of the ministry on condition of doing the following : ‘ The said Paul upon the two preaching dayes betwixt Sondayes sall come to the Kirk-door of Edinburgh, when the second bell rings, clad in sack-cloth, baire-heidit, baire-herdit, and baire-footit, and there remain whill (until) he be brocht to the sermoun, and placit in the public spectacill (stool of repentance) above the peiple in tyme of every sermoun, the said two dayes, and the Sondag thereafter sall compeir in lyke manner, and in the end of the sermoun declare signes of his inward repentance to the peiple, humbly requyring the Kirk’s forgiveness ; whilk done he sall be clad in his awin apparel and receivit in the society of the Kirk ; this same ordour to be observit in Dundie and Jedburgh.’ It was at this latter place, Jedburgh, where Methven was minister, that the offence had been committed, and it was Knox himself, who, along with certain Edinburgh elders, had been sent to enquire into the scandal. The delinquent was no ordinary man, but had been a leader in the work of reform and a fervent preacher, and that at a time when loyalty to the truth was no easy task. But Knox knew his duty, and, however distasteful on the ground of old friendship, he had a grim satisfaction in discharging it. The charge having been found true, the General Assembly publicly excommunicated Methven, deprived him of his ministerial functions, and ordered him to undergo the punishment as stated above. ‘ For two

causes,' concludes Knox in his detailed account of the matter, 'we insert this horrible fact, and the ordour kept in punishment of the same; formar, To forwairne such as travaill in that vocation, that, according to the admonition of the Apostle, "Suche as stand, tack heed lest thei fall." . . . The other cause is, that the world may see what difference thair is betwix light and darkness, betwix the uprychtness of the Church of God, and the corruption that ringes (reigns) in the synagoge of Sathan, the Papistical rable.' It may be added, that the wretched Paul Methven could not go through with it. He tried, but 'could submit no further, and proceeded to England.'

In exercising discipline the Scottish Reformers were altogether impartial. The Lord High Treasurer was as faithfully dealt with as the humblest peasant. So too was the Countess of Argyll. Knox was certainly determined to create a higher public tone in matters of morality.

But let us hear what an Englishman says of what Knox and his Church did for Scotland. 'The chief Council of the Presbyterian Church called the General Assembly,' remarks Mr T. F. Tout, M.A., Professor of Mediæval and Modern History in the University of Manchester, in his volume, *An Advanced History of Great Britain*, 'had more influence and better expressed the wishes of the people than the Scottish Parliament. From the adoption of Presbyterianism the modern history of Scotland begins, for in welcoming the new faith the Scots nation first began to grow conscious of itself. Never were movements more strongly contrasted than the short, swift, logical destructive Reformation in Scotland, and the political, compromising, half-hearted English Reformation imposed on a doubtful and hesitating people by the authority of the Crown.



But the movements had this in common, that in making Rome the common danger to both countries, it brought England and Scotland together in a fashion that had never been possible since Edward I.'s attacks on Scottish independency. Soon the old hostility began to abate between English and Scots, so that what had seemed to Henry VIII. a quite impossible thing—the acceptance by England of the King of Scots as their ruler—was peacefully accomplished after Elizabeth's death.' We may also quote here what Froude says in his *History of England*: 'But for Knox, the Reformation would have been overthrown among ourselves, for the spirit which he created saved Scotland: and if Scotland had been Catholic again, neither the wisdom of Elizabeth's ministers, nor the teaching of her bishops, nor her own chicaneries would have preserved England from revolution. . . . But for Knox and Burghley—these two, but not the one without the other—Elizabeth would have been hurled from her throne or have gone back into the Egypt to which she was too often casting wistful eyes.'

Though certainly intolerant of the contentions of others for their Churches—which was the usual attitude of reformers and controversialists—was Knox an intolerant man? He was intolerant of an enemy who was trying to kill him, for the Roman Catholics had added to their creed an article entitling them to hang and burn those who differed from them; he was intolerant towards the whole Romish system as it then manifested itself, declaring that it was of the devil; and he was intolerant just as the most enlightened Dutch philosophers became hard and narrow-minded through sufferings inflicted on them during the administration of the Duke of Alva. Knox was indeed more humane than the Scottish legislators at that

time, and it is a remarkable fact that the latter did not enforce their harsh and persecuting enactment against the celebration of the Mass except in one case in Glasgow in 1574. The Church, of course, had nothing to do with the execution of Archbishop Hamilton, nor had the celebration of the Mass. That prelate was sentenced and hanged for his complicity in the murders of Lord Darnley and the Regent Moray. About half a century after Knox's time, a priest, John Ogilvie by name (he was a Jesuit missionary), was condemned and hanged at Glasgow, but this was not done by the Presbyterians. It was under the rule of Archbishop Spottiswood, and it was nominally for high treason that Ogilvie suffered the death penalty. Perhaps, in later days, the most wonderful exhibition of the tolerance of Presbyterians is their suffering a grand monument—with much laudation thereon—to be erected to their great enemy, Archbishop Sharp, in one of their chief historic churches, namely, the parish church of St Andrews.

Philosophers of liberal tendency, and men of high literary repute, may find John Knox and his friends lacking in philosophical idealism, mental liberality, and culture, but from these reforms do not come. Philosophy and polite letters would never have accomplished the work John Knox found he had to do. In the realm of ideas, and in science, the philosophical and the learned may lead. But in the material, and much more in the spiritual progress of mankind—in the onward march of the race—the people, or men from among the people, are the leaders. They make the forward steps. Reformers come from them. The average man, the man in the street, is more in touch with the realities of life, and he is not unwilling to suffer that the progress

of the race may ensue. The men of philosophy, learning, polite letters follow that which the crowd has discerned to be the right way, and the former are probably among the last to take up their beds and walk. There is a further aspect of the matter, and here we are indebted to some thoughts finely expressed by Principal Caird in his lecture, 'The Reformation and its Lessons,' in his little volume entitled *Essays for Sunday Reading*. Dr Caird lays stress upon the fact that the Reformation was not a mere chance sound breaking upon the ear amidst a dissonance of voices, but was a note clear and loud in a great choral harmony of which the universal history of man will be the completion; nor was it a mere purposeless displacement of men and nations, nor an event to be viewed in isolated aspect, but rather one definite sweep onwards of a great advancing tide, part of a divine plan involving the progress of the race. It was more than a reformation, the clearing away of corruptions and falsehoods and injurious accretions, that had gathered around the ancient, pure, beautiful, and noble fabric of the Church. Knox and his fellow-reformers did reform and remould the Church, but that was not all they did. They made advances, or caused the race to make great advances, in truth and general well-being. The everlasting hills came nearer by their labours, and we reach these summits more readily by what they achieved; and the more we have of their spirit, and the more we apply their principles, the greater shall be our progress in these latter days. Individuality in religion was one of their great principles—the unfettering of the instincts of the soul, and the responsibility of each one of us to God, which are things no lapse of time or progress of society can ever subvert or alter. And, as the Principal points out, the Church of to-day may even reform the Reformation, for at

that time, perhaps, too much stress was laid on doctrinal accuracy and an intellectual basis of communism, while to-day stress is laid, and rightly, on religion, noble character, the state of the heart, the love and life that come from Christ Jesus.

Yet these Reformers were most practical men, as is evidenced, among other things, by their *Book of Discipline*. Such a programme, or manifesto, may have its defects, and to-day its 'Thou shalt' might be quite impracticable. There are countries and centuries where its methods could not be adopted. But what would not suit this century, or foreign countries, may have suited Scotland well enough in the sixteenth century and later. The ideals of the Book were lofty, and Parliamentary sanction of it would have been to the advantage of the 'commonwealth.' Knox knew his country well and its requirements. He may have been a visionary, but he was much more—certainly a man of the most practical energy. Scotland, he felt, required this Book, and the Utopia therein was much more realisable than that of More. As to the Church set up in the realm, John Richard Green says in his *Short History of the English People*, that 'its government by ministers (has he forgotten the lay elders?) gave it the look of ecclesiastical despotism, but no Church constitution has proved so democratic as that of Scotland. Its influence in raising the nation at large to a consciousness of its power is shown by the change which passes, from the moment of its final establishment, over the face of Scottish history.'

Knox had no half measures to propose or recommend, for he had no half convictions. But was he only a Presbyterian and nothing else? Was he only a Calvinist and nothing else? Was he only a Protestant and nothing else? Had he no wider views? Certainly

he had, and thought of other things besides Presbytery, Geneva, and Augsburg. Look at one of his last letters to the brethren in Edinburgh. At the time he was residing in St Andrews, and was an old man—at least, was very much an invalid, prematurely aged, and his end was drawing near—and this is what he writes: ‘Be faithful and loving to one another, let bitterness and suspicion be far from your hearts, and let everyone watch for the preservation of another without grudging and murmuring.’ About the same time he gives the following advice to students. The young men had been drawn to him, and here is what he says to them: ‘Use your time well; know God and His work in your country; stand by the good cause; and follow the good examples and good instructions of your masters.’ There is nothing here about Presbytery or Episcopacy, Catholics or Protestants, Mary or the Regent; but something of universal significance and of universal application. Surely this is a man removed from all narrowness of thought or vision. Here is one who sees life steadily, and sees it whole. Truth and goodness were not limited by his formula.

When we think of the faith and polity of Knox, as contrasted with that of Mary of Lorraine, the Queen Regent, the residences in Edinburgh of these two representatives of different factions, policies, and ideals come before us symbolically in an arresting manner. Where once stood the palace of the latter—a short distance from the Castle—there now stands a series of great buildings—the Assembly Hall of the United Free Church of Scotland (on the very site of the palace); the New College, in the quadrangle of which has been erected a statue of John Knox; the High Church; and the Assembly Hall of the Church of Scotland with its great lofty spire—buildings all dear to the hearts of



Presbyterians. Not a stone of Mary of Lorraine's palace remains, while these ecclesiastical edifices, on the other hand, are very much in evidence in the life of the city and of the nation, and are among the most conspicuous in the Scottish capital. Moreover, further down this central ridge, or highway, there stands the manse of John Knox—the great antagonist of the Queen Regent and her more famous daughter—a building intact, arresting to the passer-by, and visited by many. Is it giving the rein to fancy unduly and unfairly to behold here, as in symbol, the strength, development and durability of the belief and system of the Scottish reformer on the one hand ; and on the other, the weakness, decay, and disappearance of the polity of the French princess ?

## CHAPTER II

### JOHN KNOX—(*Continued*)

IN the previous chapter we have contended for the 'modernity' of Knox by adducing his preaching, his dispensing of the Sacraments in a simple manner, and his struggle for the freedom of the Church ; and when dealing with these we have given subsidiary reasons. In this chapter, we shall submit three further proofs, and, as before, shall, under each, bring in other considerations in support of our contention.

#### 4. *He broke down barriers between clergy and laity*

It is noticeable in the life of Knox that he attracted, and maintained, the friendship of many laymen. He had a capacity for friendship, and he seems never to have betrayed or lost a friend. It was a great grief to him that Kirkcaldy of Grange and Maitland of Lethington took up, latterly, the attitude they did ; and, though we are not aware that their regard for him diminished, he was pained when they went over to the camp of the enemy. Though he had many friends among the Protestant ministers, he, unlike the Romish priests, drew to the laity, and broke down walls of partition between them and an official Christian ministry. He appeared among them as their equal, and was entertained by, and entertained, them as one of themselves. Already we have referred to his friendship with Sir James Sandilands and James Chalmers of Gadgirth, and his

pleasant and profitable visits to their homes. With the Laird of Dun he had also much Christian fellowship, and consulted him on many matters public and private. Queen Mary had a high opinion of this Forfarshire gentleman, and said that 'above all, she would gladly hear the Superintendent of Angus, for he was a mild, sweet-natured man with true honesty and uprightness, John Erskine of Dun.' Buchanan says—'He was, of the first reformers, the only one who enjoyed anything like court favour, but it was without dereliction in integrity or any compromise of principle.' Spottiswood calls him 'wise, learned, and of singular courage, another Ambrose,' and Knox himself, speaks of him as one 'whom God in those days had marvellously illuminated,' 'a zealous, prudent, and godly man,' 'of meek and gentle spirit.' In the year 1555, when Knox visited Scotland for some months, Erskine of Dun was one of the first to repair to him in Edinburgh and encourage him in his work of reform. Shortly after, he stayed with him for a whole month at his house in Forfarshire, and there met 'the principal men of that county.' Later, he visited at Dun again, and, as we have seen, dispensed the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, 'whereof were partakers the most part of the gentlemen of the Mearns.' Then, at Edinburgh, we find him at a supper party in Erskine's house, where he meets for the first time—at least, in his book for the first time refers to—him who afterwards became Queen Mary's chief Secretary—'William Maitland of Lethington, younger, a man of good learning and of sharp wit and reasoning.' So says Knox, which remark may have this of Randolph to Cecil put along side of it—'Lethington hath a crafty head and a fell tongue.' It is significant that this patrician, courtier and cultured gentleman had the homely nickname of 'Mitchell Wylie,' which had nothing

to do with Mitchell or Wylie or any common name or surname; but just as the Thrums weavers called Robespierre 'Rab Speery,' so the Scots people of the sixteenth century with their difficulty in pronouncing foreign words, and perhaps never seeing them in print, called Lethington Mitchell Wylie when they really meant Machiavelli! As indicating the wide difference between John Knox and William Maitland, the 'will of God' to the former was the supreme and solitary guide, while God to the latter was but 'ane bogill of the nursery.' But there was this resemblance between the two men—both were in their outlook modern, though in different ways. We have been showing how Knox was a modern, and Andrew Lang is right when he says of Maitland of Lethington that 'he was a modern of the moderns, cool, witty, ironical, subtle, and not convinced.'<sup>1</sup>

Erskine was in middle age when the friendship between him and Knox began. In early days he had wielded lance and sword for his country, but his was now the rarer service of fighting the battle of the Evangel. He was not an unlettered man, but of much culture and refinement, a proficient in the Greek tongue, which he had learned abroad, and the study of which he was the first to introduce into Scotland. He brought over a Frenchman to teach it in Montrose. He appears, also, to have been fond of music—at least, he arranged for Church music being taught in the neighbourhood of his Forfarshire home.

With another layman Knox was particularly intimate, and that was an Ayrshire laird, Robert Campbell of

<sup>1</sup> It may be interesting to state what a highly-placed contemporary Roman Catholic thought of William Maitland of Lethington. We find it in *Pollen's Papal Negotiations with Mary, Queen of Scots*, where Vincenzo Laureo, Bishop of Mondovi, Nuncio to Queen Mary, styles him, 'astute and unprincipled,' and the 'most crafty of men.'

Kinzeancleuch. This good man was an ardent reformer, and was one of the few at Holyrood who could withstand the blandishments of the Queen and her courtiers. He saw the danger to Scotland of the royal doings, and thus addressed Lord Ochiltree: 'My Lord, now ye are come [to Edinburgh], and almost the last, and I perceive by your anger that the fyre-edge is nott off you yit; but I fear after that the holy water of the Courte be sprinckled upon you that ye sal become als temperat as the rest; for I have been here near fyve dayis, and at the first I heird everie man say, "Let us hang the priest," but after that thai had been twyse or thrise at the Abbey [Holyrood], all that fervencie was past. I think thair be some enchantment whereby men are bewitched.' Knox's comment on this speech is—'And in very deed so it came to pass . . . for the Queenis flattering words blinded all men.' Knox visited this gentleman at his Ayrshire home, and it may be mentioned that, two and a half centuries after, there also came to Kinzeancleuch (Ballochmyle) another great Scotsman—Robert Burns—who has immortalised the district by his song. In most pathetic circumstances, towards the end of the year 1572, Robert Campbell paid a return visit to Knox in Edinburgh. The Reformer was dying, and Campbell was one of the three intimates at his bedside. 'Are you in pain?' said Kinzeancleuch. 'It is no particular pain,' replied Knox, 'but such a pain as shall soon, I trust, put an end to the battle.' After a few hours Knox passed away, committing to Campbell the care of his wife and children.

It was in a layman's house—'that notable man of God, James Syme's'—and in the company of laymen—'John Erskine, the Laird of Dun, David Forrest, General of the Mint, and certain personages of the



town, amongst whom was Elizabeth Adámson, then spouse to James Barron, Dean of Guild, burgess of Edinburgh'—that plans were first laid, or at least consultations first held, concerning the great work Knox was to do in Scotland.

When in England, some years before, he must have impressed the Duke of Northumberland in a wonderful way, though the Duke's attitude towards him changed when he would not agree to certain of his proposals. Knox was certainly in close intimacy with the great in the land. A royal chaplain, Knox preached more than once before the court of King Edward VI. He was certainly busy, and deferred to, in English political affairs, many of the State Papers in the English Records Office being in his handwriting, and known to have been of his composition. On a summer day he appeared in Edinburgh, accompanied by a band of gentlemen, like a feudal lord with retainers, to answer the summons of hostile bishops. The Earl of Moray, the Earl of Morton, the Earl of Glencairn, the Earl of Mar, Lord Ochiltree, and many others of the nobility found in him a true, steadfast, and wise friend; and one has only to read his conversations with, and letters to, them, to see how different were his relations with them as compared with the attitude of the clergy of the old church towards prince and peer. The Earl of Morton was not a sentimental man, but James Melville says this strange thing of him: 'He loved John Knox.' Even Bothwell was deferential to him. He came to him one day to beg his good offices in reconciling him to the Earl of Arran. There was an authoritative dignity about Knox when the high in the land came to him for advice or counsel. It might be said that he was supreme in Scotland. Professor Rait, in his *Scotland* ('Making of the Nations' Series), says that 'the return of Knox

(in the year 1555) to Scotland gave the Regent (Mary of Guise) a more redoubtable opponent than any monarch of England, and the Protestants at once felt the inspiration of a great and noble personality.' There were some scurrilous verses written in those days—entitled *A Lewd Ballet*—by a Roman Catholic (name unknown), and in the following lines, culled from them, the power of Knox is recognised :

'The Subject now commandis the Prince, and Knox is grown  
a King :

Quhat he willis obeyit is, that made the Bisshop hing.'

But the humblest citizens also came to him for advice. At least we find that on one occasion certain citizens desired him to intercede on their behalf with the magistrates. Knox was certainly revered by the people of Edinburgh as their greatest and best man. He never failed them, and they never failed him. He held the heart of Midlothian. The Town Council would allow no slander against him to go unpunished. For example, on the 8th April 1562, we read in the Burgh Records, 'Ninian M'Crechrane, cuke to Timothie Bancour, grantit and confest he said yisterday in the hie gait : " Loving to God, my Lord Arrane and my Lord Bothwille ar aggreit now ; Knox quarter is run, he is scurgeit throw the toun " ; with sic uther injurious wordis ; quharfore, as ane raillar and sklanderer, wes ordainet to be skurgeit within the Talbuith, and thairefter to be brankit, and in case he ever committed the like injurie in tyme cuming agains the minister, actit himself of his awin consent, to be skurgeit throw this toun and baneist for ever.' A pretty stern lesson to the lieges ! And so too, with regard to heresy, or reviving of the old doctrines. On the 18th June 1563, for instance, we

find that ' Johnne Grahame, merchant [was] callit before the bailies and counsall forsaide, and accusit of divers injurious and sclanderis wordis spoken be him in maintenance of the mes and contrair the doctrine now preichit in the Kirk of God. [He] denyit the same, and oblist himself in all tymes cuming to keip mesour in his speaking and behaviour under the pane of the sale of his fredome and farther punishment as the jugis and counsale sould fynd gude.' When Knox finally left Geneva for Scotland, it was amid the ' weeping of brave men ' who venerated and loved him.

As an evidence of the high regard in which Knox was held by the principal men in Scotland, we have that trial of his before the Privy Council. Queen Mary thought that she had at last got him within her power, because of a circular letter he had written, supposed by her to be treasonable. She had him summoned before the Privy Council, and felt sure that he would be condemned to death, or, at any rate, have some severe punishment meted out to him; but the said Council—with the great nobles, Duke of Chatelherault, Earl of Moray, Earl of Glencairn, Earl of Argyll, Lord Ruthven, and many others present—voted unanimously in his favour. The Queen stormed at them, and commanded them to vote again, but once more the unanimous verdict was ' not guilty.' Knox reported the matter to the General Assembly of that year. He asked them if he had done wrong in writing the letter. The Assembly voted on the matter, and with one voice found that he had done no wrong. Moreover, they said that in writing such letters to summon the brethren, when danger appeared, the whole Church was on his side.

Was there not something daimonic about this man, which put fear upon his fellow-beings at times? For instance, when on a May morning in 1559 certain

dignitaries of the old Church were assembled in the Monastery of the Grey Friars at Edinburgh, and deliberating on measures to crush the Protestant movement, a messenger suddenly entered with anxious look, and informed them that John Knox had arrived the previous day at Leith, and was even now resting within the gates of the Capital, having a good sleep after his long journey. The clergy were panic-stricken with the news, and, anticipating now the ruin of all their plans, the council broke up in haste and confusion.<sup>1</sup>

And there was one high in the land who also took fright at Knox's arrival. This was the Queen Regent, then in Glasgow, to whom the momentous news had been conveyed in hot haste. She at once ordered him to 'be blown to the horn,' with three blasts from the the Market Cross of Glasgow, and to be denounced by the messenger-at-arms as a rebel and outlaw.

John Galt, in his *Ringan Gilhaize*, has a thrilling description of the effect of Knox's arrival in Scotland at this time. There may be exaggeration in the novelist's language, but his words are noble and eloquent and show the view taken of this advent by a man of letters some two and half centuries after the event: 'The cry rose everywhere, "John Knox is come!" All the town came rushing into the streets,—the old and the young, the lordly and the lowly, were seen mingling and marvelling together,—all tasks of duty, and servitude, and pleasure, were forsaken,—the sick-beds of the dying were deserted,—the priests abandoned their altars and masses, and stood pale and trembling at the doors of their churches,—mothers set down their infants on the floors, and ran to enquire what had come to pass,—

<sup>1</sup> This story is believed by some to be apocryphal, but Dr M'Crie credits it, and gives his reasons. See his *Life of John Knox* (Blackwood's edition, 1873), p. 126, and in particular the foot-note.

funerals were suspended, and the impious and the guilty stood aghast as if some dreadful apocalypse had been made,—travellers, with the bridles in their hands, lingering in profane discourse with their hosts, suddenly mounted, and speeded into the country with the tidings. At every cottage door and wayside bield, the inmates stood in clusters, silent and wondering, as horseman came following horseman, crying “ John Knox is come ! ” Vessels that had departed, when they heard the news, bore up to tell others that they saw afar at sea. The shepherds were called in from the hills ; the warders on the castle when, at the sound of many quickened feet approaching, they challenged the comers, were answered, “ John Knox is come ! ” Studious men roused from the spells of their books ; nuns, at their windows, looked out fearful and enquiring,—and priests and friars were seen standing by themselves, shunned like lepers. The whole land was stirred as with the inspiration of some new element, and the hearts of the persecutors were withered.’

We would notice here a true remark of a literary man—Sir George Douglas—in his account of John Galt in the ‘ Blackwood Group ’ of the Famous Scots Series, where he says, in speaking of Galt’s *Ringan Gilhaize*, which deals with one of the most remarkably interesting periods in Scottish history, that ‘ though the War of Independence be the darling theme of Scottish patriotism, what may be called the War of Religious Liberty enjoys the two-fold advantage of a wider sympathy and a deeper intellectual significance.’ Further, Sir George goes on to say that Galt, in this epic of the Scottish religious wars, penetrated farther than Sir Walter Scott, for he penetrates the crust of dourness and intolerance, and while, maintaining the balance of perfect fairness, compels his readers to sympathise with the



best of the reformers and covenanters, not only in their resentment of cruel wrongs but in their most earnestly cherished and loftiest ideals. 'It is a historical romance,' he says, 'based on a true philosophy.'

But was Knox always stern and unbending? Had he not gentler characteristics? We shall answer these questions when we come to speak more particularly of his relations with women. But, meanwhile, let it be said that he certainly had humour. He has 'meary bourds' (lively jests) in his History, and this kindly humorous way of looking at things distinguishes him from other reformers, such as Savonarola or Calvin. When Lethington was debating with him one day, he said, 'melancholious reasons wald haif sum myrth intermixed.' He had supper parties in his house, when the conversation was bright and cheery. Leaders of men, in great crises, have not been the last to see the ludicrous when strange situations call it forth. The incongruities of life—and Knox saw plenty of them—may produce deep pathos, but they are also the source of the highest humour. Laughter and tears are not so far apart after all. Knox often wept, but no one can read his History without noticing that he also laughed—'a true, loving, illuminating laugh,' says Carlyle, 'one that mounts up over the earnest visage.' We can fancy him coming away from a certain interview with Queen Mary—the subject of their talk was dancing—with a good hearty laugh. It must surely have tickled him—such talk between a beautiful, lively girl, to whom dancing was as natural as the skipping of lambs or the sporting of butterflies in the sunshine, and him the staid middle-aged minister of St Giles, to whom such pastime was altogether *unnatural*. In any case, he says himself that he came away from the royal presence with a 'reasonably merry countenance.'

Surely, too, there was humour—delightful irony—in connection with the publication of one or two of his writings when he was resident on the continent of Europe. Not wishing the place of their printing to be known, he imprinted on them: 'At Rome, before the Castel of St Angel, at the signe of Sanct Peter.'

Then how he laughs, and makes us laugh, as he tells of the extraordinary quarrel that arose between the Archbishops of St Andrews and Glasgow with regard to precedence in a certain procession. The amusing story sufficiently shows, without his informing us, that the one prelate was 'known proude,' and the other was 'knowin a glorious (*boastful*) foole.' 'Gukton' ('Fooltoun') and 'Glaikstoure' ('Silly-dust') show us that John Knox and Sir David Lyndsay were not so very far apart. He was greatly displeased with the 'raschall multitude' for destroying the Religion Houses of Perth, and exculpated 'earnest professors' from all share in such outrages. Yet it is not without sympathetic glee he tells us that 'the store of victuallis effeir to the Grey-friars monastery of Perth and their blancattis, beadis, covertouris were such as no Erle in Scotland hath the better, and their naprie so fine'; and though, perhaps, not such 'lyik aboundance was in Black-friars, yitt such thair was mair than becam men professing povertie.' And he laughs heartily as he describes the substitutes the priests provided for their sacred furniture which the rabble had destroyed—such as 'tables for altaris, whereof sume befoir used to serve for drunkardis, dysaris, and carteris; bot thay war holy eneuch for the priest and his padgeon'!

When John Lauder, the accuser at Wishart's trial, 'with hoggish voice' exclaimed, 'Is not my Lord Cardinall (Beaton) the second person within the realme, Chancellor of Scotland, Archbischope of Sanct Androis,

Bischope of Meropose [Mirepoix], Commendatour of Aberbrothok, Legatus Natus Legatus a Latere,' Knox says—' And so he recited as many titilles of his unworthy honouris as wold have lodin a schip, much sonare an ass.' Commenting on this, Dr David Patrick in a foot-note of his *Statuta* (p. 252) says, ' If one remembers all that had been said by Pope and Council on the necessity of absolute chastity in clergy, it is difficult to repress a smile when one finds Beaton's titles rehearsed at length in documents under the Great Seal connected with his illegitimate children, seven at least in number.' Do we not also see Knox's humour come out when, in speaking of the Cardinal's death, he says—' In him perished faithfulness to France *and comfort to all gentlewomen, especially to wanton widows*'? He is very humorous, too, as he describes the carrying of ' the young Sanct Geile.' Nor was he averse to harmless amusement. Did he not play at bowls? He objected to, and denounced, the Maypole and Maid Marion—there is abundant evidence that such dancing and sports had been working much evil—but he was present at the marriage of a Mr John Colvin, when, as James Melville in his *Diary* informs us, a play was acted, the subject of which was the siege of Edinburgh Castle; and we can well fancy him enjoying the besiegers and the besieged playing their parts in this mimic warfare. He did not object to dancing as such, but he objected to it when it wasted time, or was indulged in when, as if in mock defiance, God's people were suffering. Moreover, at that time—and in the palace—dancing was so connected with immorality that he inserts this in his History: ' What bruit the Maries and the rest of the dansaris of the Courte had, the ballatis of that age did witness, quhilk we for modesteis sake omit.' It has been said that sermons always exaggerate the theoretic side of

things, and that the most austere preacher, when he is out of the pulpit, and is met at the dinner-table, becomes singularly like other people. For his own part, the present writer has known ministers, most solemn and stern in the pulpit, who, when met afterwards in social intercourse, were the most delightful and humorous of men.

Knox's relations with the gentler sex show a kindness and tenderness which one would scarcely have expected in our reformer. They were very different from those of the priest in the Confessional. Here, too, he broke down barriers. At one of his very first meetings with friends in Edinburgh, he has far more to say about a lady—Elizabeth Adamson already mentioned—who was present and who had 'a troubled conscience,' than of the great work of reform in Scotland which that meeting discussed. The lady was attracted to Knox, and desired spiritual help from him; and he, 'according to the grace given unto him opened more fully the fountain of God's mercies than did the common sort of teachers that she had heard before; for she had heard none except the friars. She did with much greediness drink thereof, and at her death did express the fruit of her hearing to the great comfort of all that did repair to her.' In the letters he writes to women we see how tender his heart is, and how sympathetic he can be. Even Andrew Lang admits that he had a heart rich in affection, and that, as a private individual, he would not have hurt a fly. A good sign of a man's kindly nature is when his servants are attached to him. The saying that no man is a hero to his valet has its exception in the case of Knox, who was a great hero to his faithful 'servitor,' Richard Bannatyne. Away back in the Geneva days—in 1556—we find that Knox has in his family a servant called James; and in 1572,

in his later days, it is this same James (Campbell), who is still with him. Warm attachment causes many sorrowing ones to be with the Reformer when he lies down to die. Those November days in the Netherbow, it has been remarked, are like the last scenes of the *Pilgrim's Progress*, where a concourse of pilgrims accompany Mr Valiant-for-Truth to the riverside. Ruskin says that the old Douglas motto of 'Tender and True' may wisely be taken up again by us all, for our own, in Art and in other things; for Tenderness and Truth are characteristic of all great Art, as they are also of truly great men. With an infinite tenderness there will be associated a disdain of base and false things, and an appearance of sternness and arrogance in the eyes of hard and unthinking people.

Vehement in doctrine, Knox is also vehement in affection, and yearns for the society of absent friends. He unfolds himself in these letters. A man of independent spirit and very self-sufficing he might seem to most; but that he required to lean on, and receive benefit from, companionship, appears from some striking words in a letter to Mrs Locke: 'I have rather need of all, than that any have need of me.' To Mrs Bowes, the mother of his first wife, he wrote many letters, taking great pains in them to minister to a mind diseased. All to whom he wrote greatly prized his letters, as they resolved doctrinal difficulties and also questions of conduct. But he impressed upon them all individual faith and individual responsibility. They were to go direct to Christ, and not to any priest. He urged upon them prayer—prayer for themselves and also for him. The day after he arrived in Edinburgh for the prosecution of his great work, he sat down and wrote to a lady in London and asked her prayers for him: 'I am come,' he writes, 'I praise my God, even in the



heart of the battle . . . Assist me, my' sister, with your prayers that now I shrink not when the battle approacheth.'

Nor is there to be forgotten his affection for his converts. It is very wonderful and very beautiful. As with the Apostles, he declares they are his glorying, his longing, his joy, and his crown. For him life is a glad thing when they stand fast, but sorrow upon sorrow comes to him when they fall away. 'Their spiritual life,' he says, 'is to my heart more dear than all the glory, riches, and honour on earth.' Wherever they may be—in Switzerland, France, England, or Scotland—his interest and his love for them never cease.

Surely it could not have been a rough and rude man who attracted to him such women as Marjory Bowes and Margaret Stewart who were, respectively, his first and second wives. Both were gentle and refined ladies. The father of the first was Richard, the youngest son of Sir Ralph Bowes of Streathan, while her mother was Elizabeth, a daughter and co-heiress of Sir Roger Aske of Aske. Their married life was happy, and Calvin pays a high tribute to this Mrs Knox, saying that she was *suavissima*, and in a letter of condolence to her husband at her death he wrote, 'Uxorem nactus eras cui non reperiuntur passim similes.' ('You found a wife the like of whom is not to be easily found.') They had two sons both of whom died without issue. Knox's second wife was the daughter of Lord Ochiltree, and was of the blood royal. Though she was very much younger than he—not so young, however, as some have stated<sup>1</sup>—this marriage was also a happy one. She bore him three daughters. According to Nicol Burne, a Roman Catholic writer of the sixteenth century,

<sup>1</sup> See Dr Hay Fleming's *Critical Reviews*, p. 178.

our Reformer was also attracted to Lady Fleming—a daughter of the Duke of Chatelherault (Hamilton)—and, indeed, proposed marriage to her.

The scene is well known—the author of the History narrates it in his best manner—when Knox had some talk with the Queen's maids of honour at Holyrood. They were rather afraid of him at first. Swinburne in his *Bothwell* introduces the incident, and makes Mary Seton say :

‘What, will the man speak to us? he looks so hard,  
With such fast eyes and sad—I had not thought  
His face so great, nor presence.’

But he spoke ‘mearilie’ (merrily, in a happy, kindly way) to them, ‘procured their company,’ and delivered a telling little sermon to them, which they did not resent, but apparently took seriously to heart.

But what shall we say of his *First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women*, and his conduct towards Mary, Queen of Scots? As regards the first, it was written when he was an exile, and suffering, along with others, from the regiment (regimen, rule) of women. Such rule had been ‘monstrous’ and ‘monstriferus,’ and godly men had suffered much by it. The women he had particularly in view were the four Queens—Mary of Guise (Queen Regent of Scotland), Mary (Queen of Scots and Queen of France), Mary (Queen of England, ‘the bloody Mary’), and Catherine de Medici (Queen of France). As regards the third of these, it may not be amiss to say that he expressly prayed for her, and for the suppression of those who rebelled against her. It is a pity, however, that this book of Knox's was ever written, for there was another Queen, namely Elizabeth of England, very different from those already mentioned, who might

have been his best friend, but who never forgave him for his 'Blast,' and made the progress of Protestantism in Scotland by no means easier because of it. Her 'regiment' brought glory to England, but alas! Knox had quite forgotten such a personage. She was only the Princess Elizabeth when he penned his treatise, but within a few months of its publication she ascended the throne, and became the most powerful ally of the Reformers among crowned heads. Elizabeth felt personally insulted by the book, and would not allow the writer of it to travel through England. It is curious to notice the relations—hostility in amity—of these two personages to each other; how both were indispensable in the sixteenth century; and how the one really helped the other. The matter is succinctly and well put by Dr F. W. Maitland in *The Cambridge Modern History*, when, in dealing with Reformation times, he says, 'If now and then Knox gave her cross and candles a wipe, he none the less prayed for Queen Elizabeth's everlasting friendship. They did not love each other; but she had saved his Scottish Reformation, and he had saved her Anglican settlement.' The Scottish Reformer inserted in his liturgy a prayer that there might never more be war between England and Scotland, and that prayer was answered. Though there have been wars between British factions, there has never been, since that rubric of Knox's was framed, a truly national war between the two peoples.

The publication of the 'Blast,' then, was a serious blunder. Knox too hastily generalised. His prophetic gaze did not see 'the spacious days of great Elizabeth'; the noble reign of the wife of the Prince of Orange, Mary II.; the wisdom and tact of Queen Caroline, consort of George II.; and the long, peaceful,

and progressive reign of Queen Victoria. The 'Blast' hurt Knox in other respects than in the eyes of queens, princesses, and many other women. It estranged others from him. Knox knew so himself, for he says in a letter from Dieppe of 6th April 1559, 'My first Blast hath blown from me all my friends in England'; but, brave man and no opportunist that he is, he grimly adds, 'The second Blast, I fear, shall sound somewhat more sharp!' But the time was really out of joint. Knox was embittered by the situation, and, to use a modern colloquialism, let himself go.

The notes of the 'Trumpet' are uncompromising enough (though Jean Bodin, one of the greatest political thinkers of that time, held views precisely the same as Knox); yet the man who sounded this terrible 'Blast' was, as we have seen, much beholden to women, and women were attracted to him. In theory he may have despised the sex—at least as invested with supreme power in the State—but in practice he honoured women greatly, chose from among them his most intimate associates, and was full of admiration for their courage when he himself was faint and down-hearted. As Robert Louis Stevenson says, 'Here was this great-voiced, bearded man of God, who might be seen beating the solid pulpit every Sunday, and casting abroad his clamorous denunciations to the terror of all, and who on the Monday would sit in their parlours by the hour, and weep with them over their manifold trials and temptations.' Knox's was one of those rare natures, where we find friendship increasing and affection deepening as the years roll on, till, as it was in his case, his last days on earth—his dying hours—were sweetened and sanctified by the love and prayers of devoted friends.

As for his interviews with Queen Mary—there were

four of them, or five if we include his trial before the Privy Council, over which Mary presided—was he rude to her? We are inclined to think that those who have urged this charge against him have not read what actually took place at these interviews; and when the said interviews are quoted, they are seldom quoted in full. Let this further be remembered, that in each case Knox was summoned to the royal presence. He himself never sought an interview, never wrote a letter to the Queen, never intruded himself on her. She refused to go to St Giles' to hear him preach. But she tried to win him to her side, or at least alter or modify his attitude towards her measures and her practices. She did exercise her great gifts of fascination on him. But was he rude to her? Nay. In her presence he is quite deferential, speaks in the language of courts, and respectfully as a humble subject. He does not observe the complicated etiquette of the French court, but, as Hill Burton points out, no more would the Scots nobles of the day, Protestant or Romish. It is the case, however, that when the Queen led him to speak on matters which meant life or death for him—for which he was willing to lay down his life, and for which dastardly plots were hatched against him ('he has often been threatened with dagge and dagger,' said the Regent Morton)—then he spoke out bravely, honestly, with a force and sternness in no way discreditable to him. In dealing with moral and religious matters, whether in conversation or in preaching, Knox always spoke with directness. Swinburne rightly puts into his mouth the following sentiment:

' And seeing if one preach penitence to men  
He must needs note the sin he bids depart.

. . . This were lost breath,



To chide the general wrong-doing of the world  
 And not the very present sin that burns  
 Here in our eyes offensive ; bid serve God  
 And say not with what service.'

And the same poet, doubtless with a good deal of truth,  
 also makes Queen Mary say :

' I do think  
 I like him better than his creed-fellows  
 Whose lips are softer towards me ; 'tis some sport  
 To set my wits to his, and watch with mine  
 The shrewd and fiery temper of his spirit  
 For trial of true mastery.'

The Queen outlived Knox for fifteen years, and all that time was in captivity. She had abundant leisure in these long sad days of durance to reflect on the days that were gone, and all their turmoil and pain. Did her thoughts ever recur to that courageous man who had never spoken to her anything but the truth, and with whom was no fawning, nor flattery, as was the case with many others ?

We may state here what, perhaps, will surprise some, that subjects in those days did at times address their sovereigns in very plain language—witness, for instance, what Latimer said to King Henry VIII., and the sermon which Reginald Pole preached regarding the marriage of Anne Boleyn. And, after all, was not Knox right about the Queen of Scots ? Was not his estimate of the character and designs of this remarkable woman correct ? Nearly all historians say it was, and any who may take an opposite view surely cannot have read her private correspondence, or be aware of what her co-religionists abroad knew regarding her sinister designs on Scotland and the Protestant cause. Philip II. of Spain said of her : ' She is the one gate through which

Religion [Roman Catholic], can be restored to England. All the rest are closed.' Mary knew it, and she wrote to the Pope, 'With the help of God and your Holiness, I will leap over a wall.' Queen Elizabeth, in a sudden outbreak of fierce candour, wrote to her, 'Your actions are full of venom, as your words are of honey.'

Strangely enough, however, though Mary has always been considered a sincere and devout Roman Catholic, it is possible to doubt, or suspect, such sincerity and devotion; for was not her third husband a Protestant, and were they not married by a Protestant bishop? Moreover, there is a curious entry among her Inventories which throws strange light upon her character, showing that she did not scruple to turn ecclesiastical robes into secular clothing. The entry, which is a note from the custodian, is as follows: 'In March 1567, I delivered three of the fairest (of ten pieces of caps, chasubles, and tunicles), whilk the Queen gave to the Lord Bothwell; and mair, took for herself ane cap, a chasuble, four tunicles to make a bed for the King, all broken and cut in her own presence.' So this daughter of the Church did not scruple to make out of the sacred vestments a garment for her lover, and a counterpane for her child. Some years later, when she was a prisoner in England, we learn from Anderson's *Collections* (iv. 109, 110), that when a report was submitted to Queen Elizabeth regarding her doings, it was stated that 'this Queen [Mary] hath grown to a very good liking of our Common Prayer, and she hath received an English chaplain to her service that is a good preacher'; but, adds Knollys, 'whether this be done *bona fide* or not, or whether [it be] the tyrannous subtilty of the Cardinal Lorraine and the ambitious heads of the house of Guise,' he will not take upon him to judge. It has been said that if this pious princess had won the battle

of Langside she would have become the head of a great Catholic league, with most disastrous results for Protestantism. Apart from sundry political considerations which militate against such an assertion, it cannot be said too emphatically that the Queen who escaped from Lochleven and passed westward with a somewhat motley following—part Catholic, part Protestant—and who, from the heights above the battlefield, sadly watched her army fighting there, was certainly not the pious princess of Fotheringay. Moreover, Father Pollen has informed us what they thought of her at Rome, and nothing could have surprised the papal court more than to have seen the fair young Queen of Scots, as a devoted daughter of Holy Church, using her victory—had she gained it—to the sole interests of that Church.

Before we leave this matter we may say that there was a certain generosity in Knox's dealings with Queen Mary, and with her mother before her, the Queen Regent. In his remarkable letter to the latter he says, with as much sincerity as the Apostle Paul, that he would gladly be accursed from Christ if he could prevail upon her Majesty not to persecute the Protestants; and the same suffering he was willing to endure if only Mary, Queen of Scots, would give up what he honestly considered to be her 'idolatry,' and come over to the side of the Evangel.

In drawing to a close this section of our book—beginning with the words, *He broke down the barriers between clergy and laity*—we may be allowed to observe that this attitude, or feature, of Knox's work greatly helped in building up the Reformed Church. He gave the laity abundant opportunities for service. In the first General Assembly, as we have seen, there sat far more laymen than clergymen, and the names of the

former are sufficient guarantee that they would do well the work allotted to them. While Knox lived, indeed as early as 1564, a layman—John Erskine of Dun—was appointed Moderator of the General Assembly, and Knox himself opened the proceedings of that Assembly with prayer. Seven years later the same layman presided over the deliberations of the Supreme Court. He was Moderator four, if not five, times. All over the country, as members of Session or otherwise, laymen greatly helped their ministers. John Row, of Perth, for instance, had, as one of his elders, Lord Ruthven, a man of great worth and influence in the community. Knox's calling laymen (the term may quite well be objected to by the captious, but we know of no other at present suitable) to his aid was like Moses asking the help of men of practical sagacity—not in holy orders—for the carrying on of the great work God gave him to do. And it resulted in this, that perhaps no Church in the world—no national Church with its sisters and daughters all over the world—has made use of so many laymen for its management and supervision, as has the Church identified with the name of Knox, and laymen have given of their best to it. They have bestowed the benefit of their knowledge of the world and a more intimate acquaintance with its business than the clergy can be expected to possess. No limited or official class can carry on with success the vast and varied amount of work the Church of Christ requires, and the clergy and laity combined form an admirable means for bringing the influence of the Church and of religion to bear on the ordinary affairs of life, and exercise due effect on all classes of the community and nation.

The Presbyterian system has been found to suit well new countries such as the United States of America, the

Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, and other colonies. Professor Rudolph Sohm, of Leipzig, in his *Kirchengeschichte im Grundriss*, after referring to Zwingli's and Calvin's historical importance, says that Knox greatly extended their influence by what he did in Scotland and in the Church of England, and, through these countries, in the New World. There was a fervour of religious life in his Church, adds Sohm, and 'a power for world-wide work in shaping history.' So has it been, so is it, and so will it be in new countries. But it appears that in the eyes of some the Presbyterian system merges well, also, with the ancient systems of the East, for, at the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of England in 1918, Principal Mackichan, of Bombay, then Moderator of the United Free Church of Scotland, said he sometimes felt that in India man was naturally presbyterian. In going round the Indian villages he found that every village was regulated by an assembly of elders who were entrusted with all administration and authority within their limits, and consequently some kind of presbyterian system was well adapted to the life of the Indian people. We may add to this that, in point of fact, there is now in that great Dependency a General Assembly with Synods and Presbyteries, and that churches organised on Knoxian lines flourish there. While Knox then is a true modern in that his spirit, with his principles and methods, commends itself to the newest lands, his system also appears to commend itself to the ancient spirit in ancient lands.

##### 5. *He insisted on the Liberties and Rights of the People*

We include in this, freedom of speech, and, what we now call, the freedom of the press. The liberty of the subject with him was the liberty of the individual to



do as his conscience directed him ; freedóm of speech with him was the liberty not only of prophesying, but of asserting publicly or privately, in conference or in conversation, what one deemed to be true and right ; and the freedom of the press with him was the right to preach (for preaching then spread intelligence as newspapers do to-day), and to publish what was for the nation's and the individual's good. Knox printed a good deal in his time—books, pamphlets, tracts, manifestoes, exhortations—and we can well fancy that, like Milton, he would be an advocate for ‘liberty of unlicensed printing.’ Professor Ludwig Häusser, in one of his Lectures at Heidelberg, summed up Knox's character well when he said that he was a man of blameless purity of life and had ‘an unyielding love of liberty.’

There being nothing corresponding to a modern newspaper press, the pulpit was the organ of public opinion, and John Knox did not scruple to use it as such. Moreover, the ministers and elders were of the people, moved among the people, and were conversant with their inner thoughts and expressed opinions. In the churches, therefore, and from the pulpits of the churches, the national sentiment found expression ; and Knox's ringing words were ‘half battles of the free.’ The Scottish people had grown weary of falsehood and of faction, had become alarmed and grieved at national degradation and demoralisation, and were rising now to their true responsibility and their true destiny. They must be free ; and as their inspirer, leader, and hope in this movement for liberty, John Knox stood out pre-eminent. If the General Assembly came to exercise the influence that ought to have belonged to Parliament, that was because Parliament had become a tool in the hands of the monarch, and was far from representing popular feeling and aspiration.

In a paper which we have no hesitation in ascribing to Knox (see Laing's *Knox*, i. 411), it is declared that the votes and consent of the people are to be required in all great and weighty matters of the commonwealth.

Let it be admitted at once that the Church was Knox's chief concern, but the Church with him was a great democracy. With its government by Assemblies in which laymen sat side by side with the clergy, it was a very different institution from, and indeed better than, the Scottish Estates and the English Convocation. It was a protest against monarchical despotism and a focus of resistance against arbitrary power. It exercised a profound influence on politics. Popular protests, in point of fact, assumed an ecclesiastical aspect. A favourite expression of Knox's was the 'freedom of the realm,' and by that he meant freedom from priestcraft and kingcraft. He was all for freedom, religious and civil, so far as the times permitted. When in England he saw, and spoke out against, the Crown becoming the pivot upon which the religious future of the country was to turn. With Knox rose the hitherto unknown power of the people. Till he spoke the commonalty was dumb. He raised his stern and rugged countrymen into a people over whom neither king, noble, nor priest could tyrannise again. He turned 'men of clay into men of steel.' It was his voice that taught the Scottish peasant that he was a free man, equal in the sight of God with the foremost in the land. There was to be no slavish dependence henceforth on the will of a superior. A man made a great stride towards free citizenship when, in spite of his master's wishes, and even threatenings, he adopted the new teaching of Knox and his fellow-reformers. The *Beggars Summons* of 1559 was not only a protest against abuses in the Church, but a cry from the poor

and downtrodden in the land, for liberty. The manifesto in itself—fiery, certainly, and revolutionary in tone—was a proof that liberty was coming, if it had not already come.

It may be urged that a reformer of Knox's type would stamp out every form of thought inimical to his own theological and political conceptions. That may be true, or it may not, but the charge does not apply to the church or system he founded, for it departed from, and vehemently protested against, the mediæval conception of Church and State as one organisation, with its carnal weapons against heresy. Toleration for different creeds, and not a crushing uniformity, was bound to follow from Knox's teaching and practice. There thus arose the modern spirit in which truth must not be strangled, but must be allowed to grow, and as it beckons us we must follow it. The legislation of the Scottish Parliament in 1560—instigated by Knox—might be intolerant, but, even so, it was necessary as a policy of self-defence. Moreover, it brought to a nation fresh life. A new era of freedom thus began.

When studying the times of Knox one cannot but think of those of Cromwell about a century later. The two great leaders had many points of resemblance, although, in certain respects, the Scottish leader and the English leader were very different men. In a brilliant essay on the latter, Mr St Loe Strachey, in his book *From Grave to Gay*, points out that the Lord Protector was much more tolerant than many of his supporters; and certainly the Scottish Reformer in practice was more tolerant than many of his, and even than his own public addresses and writings indicate. It is true that Cromwell was fiercely intolerant in Ireland—a country through which he went as a dread instrument of destruction—treating its inhabitants

almost as if they were not human beings ; but the excuse for such brutality was that his mind was influenced by the atrocities and massacres the inhabitants of that island had been committing. In all other respects Cromwell was tolerant. One of his sayings was that he who truly loved justice and truth must be tolerant, and that toleration was not a mere practice based on convenience, but in itself was a religious act. Knox did not see so far and so truly, but in his practice, as already stated, he was more tolerant than many of his contemporaries, and than his own teaching and preaching would have led us to expect. Mr Strachey points out that with the Puritans of Cromwell's time—though not with their great leader himself—depths of religious feeling almost went hand in hand with a fierce intolerance, and men somehow felt that not to persecute was to grow feeble in the faith. Doubtless a similar feeling prevailed among the Scottish Protestant contemporaries of Knox. But in much earlier times did not St Bernard believe that the slaying of an infidel was a service to God, and much later did not Cardinal Newman say that a heresiarch should be treated mercilessly, 'as if he were embodied evil' ? As showing the breadth of view of Knox, and his statesmanlike qualities, contrasted with—or rather, perhaps, placed alongside of—those of another great Scotsman of the next generation, Andrew Melville, we may be allowed to quote the following from *The Scottish Reformation* (Baird Lectures) by Professor Mitchell of St Andrews, premising that the Professor was a remarkably competent and cautious historical student. 'I do not yield to many,' he says, 'in my admiration of the courage and calmness of Melville ; but I could no more think of placing him scholarly and bold, yet calm, as he generally was, nor the Book (the *Second Book of*

*Discipline*) attributed to him, more logical and more impassionately didactic though it be, before the eager, impetuous, yet sagacious Knox, with his wealth of rude eloquence and thrilling tenderness, and his Book (the *First Book of Discipline*), in which these qualities of head and heart are so closely mirrored, than I would think of placing Calvin, highly as I honour him, before Luther, or his Catechism before the Wittenberg hymn-books. I do not believe that the principles of the two Books are so widely different as they have sometimes been represented to be, or that the grand ideas of Knox concerning the laity in the Church, the education of the young, and the support and kindly treatment of the aged poor, were meant to be rejected or ignored by his great successor; but I do think these matters fall considerably into the background. Some of the nobler conceptions of the earlier Book are narrowed and the whole system stiffened; and in the contests in which the Church had then to engage with the young monarch, in vindication of her independence in her own province, positions were laid down which were soon pressed to consequences from which Knox and his associates would have shrunk.'

Knox did not spare the new lairds, Protestant for the most part, who had dispossessed the ancient Church. He charged them with being far more tyrannical and oppressive than the clergy of the Romish Church had been. The nobleman, having entered into possession—and of territory which perhaps he never would have got had it not been for Knox—had no right to say that he could do with his own as best pleased him. The tenant and labourer must also be considered, said our Reformer. Had not they rights and interests in the land, asked Knox, equal to the proprietor himself? So he would nationalise the old Church possessions—



give them to the people—for the support of religion, education, and the poor. It is surely of some significance, too, that the Parliament which practically settled Protestantism in Scotland—and whose meeting was very much due to Knox's labours—consisted of many members whose right to vote had long fallen into disuse, such as lesser barons, small property owners, and representatives of the burghs. They were there because of the interest now awakened in national affairs. While great nobles were present, humble members sat along with them—the first time for many years—and their presence indicated the quickening of the life of the commons of Scotland, and the fresh breezes of liberty that were blowing. In a prayer of thanksgiving composed by Knox about this time, and with special reference to the helpful alliance with England, God was called upon to aid the people in proving true to that 'instrument by which we are now set at this liberty.' Knox told Sir James Crofts, the Governor of Berwick, that if England took up the cause of the Congregation they would form a mutual league against the French, and that their reasons for desiring such a league were two, namely, the reform of religion, and the restoration of their ancient laws and liberties.

We admit that the language and the enactments of Parliament and Church then may have been stern and harsh, but the fight for freedom would have been in vain without them. Knox himself was vehement in words, but he was cool and sagacious in conduct. Moreover, the reformers—revolutionaries indeed they may be called—honoured more the breach than the observance of their harsher laws and decisions.

It is a true word of Principal Lindsay, in his *History of the Reformation*, when he says: 'It is curious to see how this conflict between autocratic power and religious

rights of the people runs through all the interviews between Mary and Knox, and was, in truth, the question of questions between them. Modern democracy came into being in that answer: 'What have you to do,' said she, 'with my marriage? or what are you within this Commonwealth?' 'A subject born within the same, madam,' said he, 'and albeit I neither be Earl, nor Baron, within it, yet hath God made me (how abject that even I be in your eyes) a profitable member within the same. Yea, madam, to me it appertains no less to forewarn of such things as may hurt it, if I foresee them, than it does to any of the nobility; for both my vocation and conscience crave plainness of me.'

As regards the government of a country, Knox held that no one—prince or princess—had any original interest and indefeasible right to rule over a people independent of their will or consent. The public good was the main concern, and magistrates, higher and lower, were in office for that end. The law of the land must be superior to the will of any monarch. He did not seem to care much whether or not Queen Mary ratified the Acts of the Scottish Parliament establishing Protestantism. He said, in that connection, that 'the sword and sceptre were rather a glorious vain ceremony than a substantial point of necessity required by a lawful Parliament.' If the Crown and the nobles oppressed and persecuted the people, then the people must strenuously resist them. The civil and the spiritual rights of the individual must be conserved at all hazards. Such political individualism might be new and revolutionary, but Knox preached and practised it, and he thereby laid the foundation of Scotland's, and, we might indeed say, the British Empire's civil and religious liberty. Even Buckle has to admit this, for he says: 'At a most hazardous moment the clergy kept alive the

spirit of national liberty. What the nobles and the Crown had put in peril, that did the clergy save. They were the guardians of Scottish freedom.' Knox preached all this in St Giles' and elsewhere, as a publicist would do in his speeches now, or an editor in the columns of his newspaper. His religious views were really his political opinions.

The Earl of Moray, for a year and a half, would not speak to Knox. Why? Because the latter spoke so fiercely and so uncompromisingly about Queen Mary's having Mass celebrated at Holyrood. But why did Knox thus speak? Because he dreaded it more than ten thousand armed men landed in the country. And why? Not only because it was the symbol of Popery—and Popery was bloodthirsty at that time—but also because, if the nobles followed their sovereign in this—and many were inclined to do so—and the people followed them, the old Church would once more assert itself, and not only would the individual man's freedom go, but a coalition between France, Spain, and Scotland would ensue, Mary would succeed to the throne of Elizabeth, and all the work of Reform would fall to the ground with grievous disaster to the nations. There would have been nothing to prevent the Duke of Alva with his army arriving on the eastern coast of Scotland—indeed, the conditions were drawn up for its reception and support—but that bloodthirsty Duke had to wait, and wait in vain, for 'the day.' Knox, with the Scottish commons at his back, saved the situation. The Earl of Moray came to see, and all others now see, that Knox was right in the attitude he took up. Our Reformer wished, and prayed, and laboured, that Mary might conform to the religion of her subjects. He would make that a condition of her wearing the Scottish crown. But, however severe and savage may be the

criticism directed against Knox for this, 'it should not be forgotten—indeed, should be emphasised—that Knox's ground is that which the British Constitution takes to-day, that the sovereign of a Protestant nation should be a Protestant. Other times and other manners might quite easily have sanctioned that Holyrood Mass ; but our Reformer had to do what was necessary for his country at that period. The age was intolerant, and Protestants had to be intolerant in that matter ; but the principles Knox and his fellow-labourers laid down—tinged certainly with the spirit of the age, and accommodated to a rude and unsettled state of society—made all ultimately for religious liberty. Already it has been stated in this book that George Buchanan always mentions Knox in terms of high respect. Would Buchanan have so respected him, if he had not been a liberator and a determined foe of all autocracy and tyranny ? Not only did the great humanist respect the great reformer, but he gave him all the aid he could in his reforming work, and in his setting up of the new Church. Surely he would never have done so if this new, or rather reconstituted, Church was not to be a free Church, and the promoter of freedom throughout the realm. And no man has ever suspected George Buchanan's liberalism. His famous treatise *De Jure Regni apud Scotos* was a great charter of liberalism, and won for its author the title ' The Father of Liberalism.' Spottiswood tells us that, while Andrew Melville's pupils in St Andrews should have been studying Calvin's *Institutes*, they were pondering over and discussing the contentions of Buchanan's *De Jure*. And this great protagonist for free government was Knox's coadjutor in making a new and free Scotland. The principles as expounded by these two men were as good seed, scattered in many lands, which took root, and grew up, and

yielded rich fruit. To change the figure, we may say that Cromwell and his followers, the English Revolutionists of 1688, the constitutional monarchies of the present day, and the United States of America, can trace the stream of their history to its fountainhead in the victory which Knox and his coadjutors won over absolutism, and their assertion of the universal supremacy of the divine moral law. The brotherhood of man is emphasised in the *First Book of Discipline*. For the downtrodden 'labouraris and manuraris (*i.e.* cultivators) of the ground' there is great sympathy. They are our poor brethren. Rank is nothing to the compilers of that book, and one of the objections therein to funeral sermons is that ministers are thereby tempted to have respect of persons, preaching at the burial of the rich and honourable and keeping silence when the poor and humble leave this world. Seeing that with God there is no respect of persons, 'thair ministerie apperteanes to all alike.' Knox venerated government. His *Book of Discipline* is a code of laws for an ideal Commonwealth, liberal—for the most part—practical and statesmanlike. It was meant to guide, transform, and purify the national life. In his letters we find sober warnings against fanaticism and rebellion. He cannot praise too highly a good governor, and would almost give him unlimited powers. He admired very much, for instance, the manner in which Geneva was governed, and that he himself was a good and highly esteemed citizen thereof is proved by the fact that, when finally leaving it, he was presented with the freedom of the city. His words regarding Geneva are: 'Manners and religion are so sincerely reformed that I have not yet seen the like in any other place.' It may be urged that his opinion was biassed through his friendship with Calvin, who was practically its Governor, and because



the government was a theocracy. John Calvin certainly did aim at making Geneva a City of God, and all must admit that, in spite of great opposition and more than one temporary defeat, he made great and beneficent changes. Savonarola in Florence attempted the same by somewhat similar methods, but his success was not great. The Swiss city, perhaps the most frivolous and licentious in Europe, became one of the most earnest and righteous. The taverns were emptied, and sobriety, diligence, and eagerness for good education prevailed. The legislation of such a government may seem inquisitorial and fastidious—to be condemned, too, is the cruel pile of Servetus—but such things (and Servetus's dreadful death was approved by the Roman Catholic Church as well as by the Protestant, though all are agreed now that it was a crime) were *sequelæ* of the Middle Ages. Even a Roman Catholic like Professor Charles Sarolea accords great praise to the system of Calvin. In a letter to a Scottish newspaper (*The Scotman*, Nov. 2nd, 1917), while disparaging Luther and Lutheranism, he says: 'Whatever may be urged against Calvin, at any rate the seed of Calvinism has produced six noble trees of liberty—Geneva, the Huguenots, the United Netherlands, the Scottish Covenanters, the English Commonwealth, and the American Pilgrim Fathers.'

Later, we shall speak of Knox as an educationist, and his splendid system of Primary Schools, High or Grammar Schools, and Universities. Meanwhile, let it be said that the whole meaning of his great educational scheme, as declared in a prefatory sentence to the *Book of Discipline*, was the love of light and liberty, and a hatred of superstition and oppression. Moreover, the fundamental aim of his educational polity was 'the comfort and profits of the Commonwealth.'

such comforts and profits having a prior claim to the whim of the parent. He discerned that the child had rights as valid as the father's, and that the Commonwealth had claims upon the child which no father could be allowed to ignore. His book recognised every cultivated mind and every disciplined will as an addition to the nation's well-being, power, and prestige. The various departments of knowledge he did not consider as dangerous to Christian faith. This man who broke the bonds of feudalism would also dispel all dark clouds from the human mind. Even writers, strongly conservative, do not withhold their meed of praise from this reformer—witness Sir William Stirling-Maxwell, who, in his *Miscellaneous Essays and Addresses*, says: 'No man in England or Scotland, who values liberty, national, civil, or religious, can speak of Knox without reverence and gratitude.'

Anarchy was hateful to Knox, and, on learning when at Geneva that some of the adherents of Reform in Scotland were thinking of revolution, he wrote a letter most earnestly dissuading them from spreading or supporting any such movement. For bad government, however, and bad rulers he had great detestation, and for corruption and tyranny he had no mercy. When he returned to Scotland in 1559 he at once joined those who were opposed to what might be called the evil French rule in this country, and he issued many manifestoes making clear the situation to his countrymen, and exhorting them to stand together to secure good government. Here is what he says in one of them: 'If it be seditious to speak the truth in all sobriety, and to complain when they are wounded, or to call for help against unjust tyranny before that their throat is cut, then cannot we deny, but we are criminal and guilty of tumult and sedition. For we have said that

our Commonwealth is oppressed, that 'we and our brethren are hurt by the tyranny of strangers, and that we fear bondage and slavery, seeing that multitudes of cruel murderers are daily brought into our country without our counsel or knowledge and consent. We dispute not so much whether the bringing in of more Frenchmen be violating of the appointment (which the Queen and her faction cannot deny to be manifestly broken by them in more cases than one) as that we would know, if the heaping of strangers above us, without our counsel or consent, be a thing that may stand with the liberty of our realm and with the profit of our Commonwealth.'

We do not say that Knox himself might not have persecuted or curtailed the liberty of the subject—or, putting it in this other way, that he would not have objected to his *good* King or Governor doing such things—for he approved of the burning of Servetus and of the assassinations of Cardinal Beaton and David Rizzio <sup>1</sup> (though it would appear that when any man's existence became obnoxious there was but one method of dealing with him in that period of Scottish history); but, as with many other liberators then, his eyes were holden, and he did not see the full nature, with its attendant charity, of civil and religious liberty. Yet, as already stated, he laid down the principles by which that liberty was obtained. We do not hesitate to say that John Knox, more so than John Calvin, was, as regards many things, in advance of his time. Was he not a Christian socialist? His *Book of Discipline* merges the individual in the society—precisely as the modern socialist desires. The combined authority of Church and State compels every individual to serve the community in the best manner possible. Such may seem an infringement

<sup>1</sup> See Note 1.

on the liberty of the subject, but it is the socialistic compulsion for the ultimate realisation of the highest liberty. In Knox's days, or very shortly after his death, there was a movement—'certainly a very natural one,' says Hill Burton—towards the establishment of an ecclesiastical censorship over the press. Not very much came of it, but the same historian says that a Committee was appointed to 'oversee' a certain book, said Committee being 'remarkable for the eminence of its members,' and that 'where censorship has existed, literature has often taken vengeance on the censors by sarcasms on their ignorance and their incapacity to understand what they are castigating; but here it was probably the author's grief that he was put into the hands of masters only too capable of detecting any deficiency in his attainments.'

But there was considerable toleration among our Scottish Reformers. It is really wonderful how, when they did get the upper hand, they perpetrated little injustice—not to say cruelty—towards their opponents. We look in vain in Scotland at that time for *chambres ardentes*, edicts like those of Chateaubriand, massacres like those of Amboise, or a prolonged and bloody civil war. It was no Protestant, but a 'most Catholic King,' who, in his royal clemency towards his Flemish subjects, about this time ordered an *Edict of Moderation* to be promulgated by which obstinate heretics were no longer to be burned *but only strangled!* In point of fact, Knox and his fellow-reformers dealt kindly with the monks and priests of the old Church. The Roman Catholic bishops were allowed to retain their seats in Parliament, and continued to enjoy their revenues subject to certain provisions. The very first General Assembly passed an Act to the effect that all persons who had borne office in the Romish Church should

receive maintenance from the funds of the Reformed Church. Monks and nuns long remained chanting their matins and vespers. As late as 1590 'monks' portions' were still being paid out of the revenues of the Abbey of Arbroath, and even later, in 1592, there were still regulars living the monastic life in the Abbey of Crossraguel.

As regards the freedom of the press, or rather the advisability of reporters being present when discussions of public importance were taking place, we have a curious illustration of Knox's feeling in the matter at the Disputation on the Mass which took place at Maybole between him and the Abbot of Crossraguel. As some incidents connected therewith throw interesting side lights on the Reformer and the times in which he lived, we shall give a brief narrative of what took place. The venue was the house or 'place' of Andrew Gray, the last provost of the Collegiate Church of Maybole. It was situated in the Back Vennel, now called John Knox Street. The Maybole people still identify a certain house in that street as the scene of the famous controversy, but the building seems too small for the number of people that were present, the assemblage having consisted of forty persons on each side. There would also be many onlookers, for people had flocked to the scene from all quarters. The town was crowded. Maybole was really the capital of Carrick then, and a place of some importance. The present writer knows the town and neighbourhood well, and though 'the capital of Carrick' has changed much within recent years, in those remote days it was, as Hill Burton says, one of the best specimens of those old 'winter hotels or residences in the head burghs of counties or chief central towns, around which the chief lord of the district—here the Earl of Carrick—created a social circle



which had in it something of the nature of a court.' It was in September 1562 that the Disputation took place, and for three days the argument went on, beginning at eight o'clock in the morning. The main question was, whether the bread and wine brought by Melchizedek to Abraham was, or was not, a type of the Mass. Abbot Kennedy, like a sulking salmon, says one, dived to the bottom at once, and it required a skilful angler to move him. Knox did all he could, but the spirit and the language of the debate were mediæval, of as little significance to us as any scholastic dispute ever held at Pisa, Paris, or Valladolid. There is a good deal of truth in the comment of the Rev. Roderick Lawson of Maybole: 'The question is of a kind that can never be settled. The Abbot could not prove that Melchizedek's offering was a type, and Knox could not prove that it was not, and so the fight ended in what we call a *draw*.' But the Maybole people held that Knox had triumphed, for at the close of the Disputation the books brought by the Abbot for reference, amounting to a cartload and more, were consigned to the flames on the village green as a bonfire in honour of the Reformer. Though the method of argument may be considered mediæval, Knox in other respects was a precursor of modern ways. In fact, we find in the preliminary wrangle a curious illustration of the contrast between the new system and the old—Protestantism and Roman Catholicism. Knox wanted as many present as possible—asked, in fact, that the debate be held in Ayr—but Kennedy wanted only a few; Knox was anxious that the proceedings be opened with prayer, but Kennedy objected (though he admired the prayer, of which, being ended, the Abbot said, 'Be my faith, it is weel said'); Knox stipulated that scribes take down the proceedings—or, as we would say nowadays, that reporters be present—

and carried his point. We may add that in this debate Knox reveals three characteristics, namely, courtesy, humour, and a practical bent. As Kennedy was the son of an earl, and of an earl's daughter, in truth a lordly abbot, Knox is very courteous and addresses him as 'My lord,' but—and this is quite characteristic of the Reformer—'by reason of blood, and not of office.' Then, as showing how, even in dealing with the gravest of subjects, his humorous nature comes into play racy and satirical, he introduces the 'bold and puissant mouse,' as contrasted with the priest at the altar and his 'feble and miserable God' there—the consecrated wafer. Once more, as showing how practical and humane Knox is, at the close of the third day's debate, he suggests that, as 'the noblemen here assembled are altogether destitute both for hors and man,' the debate might be adjourned to the town of Ayr, 'whair better easement might be had for all estates'; to which proposal the Abbot would not agree—as possibly he had enough of it—and so the great debate came to an end.

Abbot Quintin, of the noble house of Cassilis, died two years after this, and was the last of the long roll of Abbots who had presided over the once rich and powerful Abbey of St Mary's, Crossraguel.

A lover of freedom, then, was John Knox. Had he been in the habit of putting his thoughts into verse, he might well have written in similar strains to Robert Burns, who wrote some two centuries later :

' Here's freedom to him that wad read,  
Here's freedom to him that wad write,  
There's nane ever feared that the truth should be heard,  
But them wham the truth wad indite.'

*6. He Was a Strenuous Advocate of Education*

Scotland for long was (and we trust still is) one of the best educated countries in Christendom ; and for that, to a great extent, thanks are due to John Knox. Not only in the cities and large towns, but throughout the country districts, a good education could be obtained. While as late as the beginning of the nineteenth century, few children of the English, and scarcely any of the Irish, industrial class, had any chance of receiving instruction, Scotland, through the masterly scheme of our great Reformer—though it was not till 1696 that it was fully carried out—had its school in every parish.

For a century or so before the Reformation, Scotland did not lag behind in the matter of education. The old Celtic Church and the Romish, which in the days of Queen Margaret and her son took its place, did a great deal for the instruction of the people. In perusing the early Acts of the Scottish Parliament, one cannot but notice frequent references to schools and school-masters. Attached to the Cathedrals and Abbeys were excellent schools, and from them issued many studious young men who found their way to continental seats of learning. They were in the habit of migrating from college to college, going from Louvain to Paris, and from Padua to Bologna. That they were numerous is evidenced by the fact that Scotsmen had a 'nation' to themselves at the third named of these universities. As a proof of the excellent early training of these northern scholars, as well as of their natural ability and great diligence, quite a number became professors and rectors of the University of Paris, and of nine men studying there during part of the fourteenth century every one became a Scottish bishop.

The wandering Scottish student appears to have been a personage not to be trifled with. He had a reputation for courage, and like his native thistle would not allow himself to be assailed or crushed with impunity. In the Chronicle of Jocelyn of Brakeland, we are told of an English monk who, when journeying through Italy to Rome on a visit to the Pope—though this was long before the fifteenth or the sixteenth century—for safety's sake pretended to be a Scotsman. Putting on the garb and gesture of a Scotsman, this monk—afterwards Abbot of St Edmondsbury—says, 'I often brandished my staff in the way they use that weapon called gaveloc (a pike?) at those who mocked me, using threatening language after the manner of the Scots. I did so to conceal myself and my errand, that I should get to Rome safer in the guise of a Scotsman.' The 'Scot abroad' in the Middle Ages appears to have had characteristics somewhat different from those usually credited to him to-day by foreign people. There was a mediæval saying, 'Scotus est, piper in naso,' 'He is a Scot, he has pepper in his nose,' and the French in those remote days used to say, 'Fier comme un Ecosse,' both proverbs indicating a hotness of temper, high-spiritedness, and pride, which made the Scot keen to detect and swift to avenge any slight cast upon him, or upon his native land. He was certainly argumentative. Erasmus in his *Praise of Folly*, says that the Scots of his time were known not only for proclaiming the nobility of their birth, but also for their intellectual acumen, and John Major avers that foreigners seem to have inferred their contentiousness from some of them having heard Scotsmen disputing about benefices before the Roman Court. Their 'canniness,' however, even then was in evidence, for the French had a saying, 'The Scot brings in a small horse first, and afterwards a big one.'

Scottish students also crossed the Tweed, and proceeded south to study at Oxford and Cambridge, as the *Rotuli Scotiæ* show, these *Rotuli* being collections of safe-conducts issued to Scottish students. We find that in one year no less than eighty-one such *Rotuli* were granted to young Scots, who were anxious to proceed to Oxford. At this University, we learn, these young men thought for themselves, for in the year 1382 (according to the *Rotuli Scotiæ*, ii. 45-46) Richard II. forbade the chancellor and proctors molesting Scottish students notwithstanding their damnable adherence (*damnabiliter adherere*) to the Anti-Pope. It has even been said that it was through these Scottish students, studying in England, that Wycliffe's tenets came to be known in the northern kingdom.

For a number of years, however, before the Reformation and during its conflicts, education had sadly ebbed. This is denied by W. Forbes Leith, S.J., in a recent work entitled *Pre-Reformation Scholars in Scotland in the Sixteenth Century*. He contends that the clergy of the old Church were by no means discreditable. But Dr Hay Fleming, in a pamphlet criticising the book, conclusively shows that they were worse than discreditable, and he gives abundant proof for the unreliableness of Father Leith's volume. Here is the view of a Roman Catholic writer of those days, Abbot Quintin Kennedy, mentioned above. He says that when 'they (the grasping nobility) have gotten a benefice, if they have a brother or son, who can neither sing nor say, nourished in vice all his days, he shall be immediately mounted on a mule, with a side-gown and a round bonnet, and then it is a question whether he or his mule knows best to do his office.' The old Church at that time had codes or canons in plenty, but in none of these is discernible the clear ring we find in



John Knox's utterances regarding the necessity and advantages of a good education. Many of the high schools had ceased to exist, and there was stagnation and decay in the universities. As at the continental universities, the students would very likely exercise their minds in trifling and absurd questions. One, for instance, wrote to his spiritual father in great mental agony that he had touched his hat to a Jew by mistake. He thought the man was a doctor of divinity. Was this a mortal sin? Could he, his father, absolve him? Could the bishop? Could the Pope? At the School of Logic at Louvain a four days' debate took place regarding the status of a man who was a member of ten universities, he having taken his degree at Louvain, Paris, Oxford, Cambridge, Padua, and five other universities. Now, a university was a body; and one body might have many members; but how could one member have many bodies? The member would be the body, and the universities the members, and surely it would be scandalous to assert anything of the kind regarding such grave and learned corporations. The disputants gave up the problem in despair. Again, we find a certain professor arguing that Julius Cæsar could not have written Cæsar's *Commentaries*, because that book is in Latin; Latin is a difficult language; and a soldier ever marching and fighting has certainly no time to learn Latin. Among the leaders of the old Church in Scotland one cannot fail to notice an intellectual weakness and helplessness. Archbishop Hamilton promised to furnish the nation with good preachers, but they never appeared.

There was still, however, a craving for learning in many of Scotland's sons, and Knox saw that this must be satisfied. Moreover, the new faith being one which involved trust in the people—and Presbyterianism

being so democratic—Knox and his fellow-reformers perceived the necessity for the people being well educated. So in the *Book of Discipline* appeared a liberal and enlightened—indeed, magnificent—scheme of national education, which recommended—and asked Parliamentary sanction for—the endowment of a school in every parish, high schools or colleges in all the chief towns, and an increase in the power and influence of the universities. At once these latter revived, and a fourth, that of Edinburgh, was founded by royal charter in 1582. Scottish students came home from seats of learning on the continent of Europe, and superintended the new systems. All was brought into harmony with the every day life of the people. Day, or public, schools were given a preference over boarding schools, and learned men of the highest character were employed as inspectors over districts duly marked out. Knox would have no voluntary attendance, but urged that it should be compulsory—at least, on the part of two classes of society, the upper and the lower. The middle class he could trust to its own natural desire for a good education. There would be free education for the poor, and the sons of the nobility would be required to pay according to their several degrees. As for youths of ‘pregnant parts,’ Knox would have the State lay hold of such, and assist them at the high schools and universities, and in that way the whole Commonwealth would be benefited. These Scottish reformers had no fear of a minister being too learned for preaching ‘the Evangel.’ On the contrary, they required their candidates before beginning Theology, to be trained in Dialectics, Mathematics, Physics, Economics, Ethics, Politics, and Hebrew. It may be stated here that, according to Dr Maitland Anderson, in his *Handbook to the City and University of St Andrews*, there was a

temporary lull at the Reformation period, as regards matriculation and graduation, but a marked increase took place in the number of students during the fifty years that followed, as compared with the fifty years immediately preceding the Reformation. Knox, in a letter written in the last year of his life, passed some severe strictures on the universities, and, partly as the result of certain painful experiences of his own at that time in connection with the St Andrews colleges, he seems to have anticipated dangerous interference with the Church on the part of the universities.

*The Book of Discipline*, as it unfolds its great scheme, has running comments on the advantages of learning—its desirability for its own sake and its great benefit to the realm—and it closes with this noble appeal to the Great Council of Scotland to whom the Book is addressed, and on whom the issue of the matters therein depended: ‘If God shall grant quietness and give your Wisdoms grace to set forward letters in the sort prescribed, ye shall leave wisdom to your posterity, a treasure more to be esteemed than any earthly treasures you are able to provide for them, which without wisdom, are more able to be their ruin and confusion, than help and comfort. And as this is most true, so we leave it with the rest of the commodities (matters) to be weighed by your Honours’ wisdom, and set forward by your authority, to the most high advancement of this Commonwealth, committed to your charge.’

But the Great Council did not take measures to carry out the scheme, and why? Some to-day might say, the scheme was too much a Church one, and surely it was not right that the Church should have the entire management of national education. Apart from the fact that, with Knox, as with all leaders of opinion then, Romish

and Protestant, the Church and the nation were in large measure identical terms, the reply to such a cavil is, that no other body could then have undertaken the task. The Church was able to undertake such national duties, just as it was willing to undertake the care of the poor throughout the land. Moreover, the funds really belonged to the Church, and Knox's view was that the old patrimony of the Church should be devoted to (1) The Support of Ministers and Superintendents, (2) Provision for the Poor, and (3) National Education. A member of his class has informed us that the late Dr Alexander R. MacEwen, Professor of Church History, New College, Edinburgh, said in one of his lectures, when mentioning that Parliament would not ratify the first *Book of Discipline*, 'it was better that it did not.' For this age, and for a century or two earlier that might be true; but other times other measures, and we cannot but think that for Scotland in the sixteenth century Parliament could not have done better than to give statutory enactment to this remarkable disciplinary book.

It was not, however, opposition to the Church as such administering these funds, and devoting part of them to education, that frustrated Knox's reasonable and statesmanlike plans, but it was the greed of the nobility.<sup>1</sup> Queen Mary's arrival from France may have complicated the situation to a great extent, and political considerations may have weighed with the lords in their negative attitude towards the *Book of Discipline* with its national scheme of education. This aspect of the matter has had stress laid upon it by Professor Hume Brown, in his *Life of John Knox*, (vol. ii. page 170), where he says that such a low motive as greed will not adequately account for the conduct of

<sup>1</sup> See Note 2.

the Protestant lords; but in page 140 of the same volume he admits that the new Church's claim to inherit the wealth of the old Church was what determined the fate of the Book, for the lords would look askance at such a claim. There was abundance of money for Knox's purpose. The wealth of the old Church was very great, amounting, indeed, to nearly one-half of the whole wealth of the country. It is true that as the Reformation approached the old hierarchy began, in direct opposition to their own canons, to alienate the temporalities to the lords and lairds around. The Crown, too, as regards ecclesiastical possessions at its disposal, did the same, and its favourites thus became wealthy. The nobles enriched in this way became hostile to the claims of the Reformed Church, and saw that, with what had now taken place, they might become still further enriched. What Hallam asserts of many of the English nobility was true of their Scottish confrères, that at that time 'according to the laws of human nature, they gave a readier reception to truths which made their estates more secure.'

It may be that the old Church, in its days of power, had really filched land and money from their ancestors, and now the nobles had this opportunity of regaining their possessions. In any case, all that the Reformers could get was, through an assumption by the Crown, one-third of the benefices. But, in point of fact, only a part of that came to the Church, the old possessors and the Crown getting a large share. Knox said of this arrangement: 'I see two parts are freely given to the devil, and the third part must be divided between God and the devil. It will not be long before the devil shall have three parts of the third, and judge ye what God's portion shall be.' When Lord Erskine, afterwards Earl of Mar and Regent, led the opposition to Knox's



scheme of division of the Church's patrimony, the latter said of this nobleman's attitude: 'No wonder; if the poor, the schools, and the ministers had their own, his kitchen, indeed, would lack two parts, and more that he unjustly possesses.' Even God's part was shamefully paid, the Church being put to strange straits to get it. Nor was this only Church money, but, as Knox and his friends contended, it was money for the poor. Bitterly was our Reformer disappointed with the attitude and treatment on the part of the Crown and the nobles. The matter lay in his mind when he was dying. Even then, in the death chamber, he could not but denounce the 'merciless devourers of the patrimony of the Kirk,' who were also robbers of that which belonged to the 'poor labourers of the ground.'

But was this great educationist—the deviser of such liberal things for the improvement of the minds of his countrymen—also so great an obscurant and so much a Goth as to destroy some of Scotland's finest buildings, the very contemplation of which was an education in itself? We think not. It is perhaps too late in the day to say—surely the historic fact is known to all by this time—that noble piles such as the Abbeys of Melrose, Dryburgh, Jedburgh, and Kelso were destroyed by English invaders a decade at least before Knox began his work of reform, and indeed when he was quite an unknown personage in the land. Lawless borderers, too, had contributed to their ruin. Then, are those Roman Catholic writers, who defame John Knox for destroying religious edifices, aware that their fellow-religionists—the twelfth-century builders of St Andrews Cathedral—broke to fragments the beautiful old Celtic cross-slabs that they might serve as common rubble? Such vandalism was probably due to the

great dislike of the Romish Church for that of the Culdees which they were then endeavouring to supplant. In later days, Cardinal Sermoneta, writing in 1556, ascribes the ruinous plight of Scottish churches and monasteries to 'hostile inroads and the avarice and neglect of those placed in charge of them.' As for the great Cathedral of St Andrews, it is yet to be proved—contemporary evidence is entirely lacking—that the Reformers demolished it. The edifice had long shown signs of weakness, and in the course of years neglect and thieving house-builders brought it to the ground. Holyrood Abbey was certainly not destroyed by the Reformers, and the noblest unmutilated specimen of Scottish ecclesiastical architecture, Glasgow Cathedral, owes its splendid preservation to the Protestant ministers, magistrates, council, and deacons of crafts of that city. Even Sir Walter Scott, in his very beautiful reference to that stately fane (by the mouth of Andrew Fairservice in *Rob Roy*—a passage much admired by Ruskin), falls into the error that the Reformers wished to demolish this pride and ornament of Glasgow and out of its material build a number of smaller churches, but that the trades of the city rose in tumult to stop the sacrilegious work. It was solely on the authority of Archbishop Spottiswood that such a statement was originally made, but it has no support whatever from the records of the Town Council of Glasgow or of the Privy Council. The documents of the time bear out that the ministers and magistrates of Glasgow, so far from wishing to pull down the Cathedral, were anxious to uphold and repair it, pressed on the King and Privy Council to do so, and voluntarily assessed themselves to carry out the work. There was a good deal of lead on the roofs of ecclesiastical buildings, and the State used it for military purposes. In 1568

the lead on Elgin Cathedral was removed for 'the sustentation of the men at war'; and such, too, was the case with St Machar's at Aberdeen. The clergy lamented and protested against the ruination of the churches (witness specially a sermon by David Ferguson, minister of Dunfermline, preached in 1572), and the records of the General Assembly provide many testimonies to the desire on the part of the Church for the preservation and good order of the fabrics of the churches.

One of the keenest controversies Knox had with the Privy Council was to secure the repair of churches 'in such a manner as appertaineth as well to the majesty of the Word of God as unto the ease and commoditie of the people.' It should be remembered, however, that even before Knox spoke the people were beginning to look with hatred and contempt on buildings identified with so much wealth and luxury and indolence. Dr William Law Mathieson says that 'the monasteries were destroyed mainly by disaffected Catholics,' and the voice for their overthrow may have come from elsewhere, but 'the hand was Sir David Lindsay's.' Nor were Knox and his coadjutors destroyers of manuscripts and books. This has been charged against them, but the cavil—including Archbishop Spottiswood's sweeping statement on their iconoclasm—has been effectively dealt with by Dr Hay Fleming in chapters x., xi. of his book, *The Reformation in Scotland*. Knox has been particularly blamed for the destruction of the rich and beautiful religious buildings in Perth and neighbourhood. True it may be that it was Knox's voice that gave the signal for the pitiless work that went on, but, when he saw that the people in their rage were going too far, he was greatly vexed, and set out hurriedly to rescue, if possible, the Abbey of Scone, but, alas! arrived too late on the scene. He was in

time only to save the bishop's giral.' Roundly he rebuked 'the rascal multitude' for their conduct, and, indeed, was so displeased that 'he could not speak patiently to any man of Perth or Dundee,' for destroying such a beautiful abbey.

About a hundred years after Knox's time the spirit of Puritanism greatly destroyed artistic feeling, and the niggardliness of the heritors in keeping the ancient buildings in a state of repair, or rather disrepair—in using indeed their lead, slates, and carved stones even, for their mansions and farm-houses—did far greater injury to the churches and abbeys of Scotland than ever John Knox's preaching did.

The æsthetic sense, we may suppose, was lacking in our Reformer, but what he desired and strove after was that excrescences—'symbols of idolatry' and the like—be removed. We cannot find anywhere in his writings the saying attributed to him, that if the nests be pulled down the rooks will fly away. Apart from the fact, in all likelihood known to Knox, that more than the pulling down of nests—even the destruction of the whole clump of trees—is necessary for the getting rid of rooks, he was in favour of lawful and orderly methods for the destruction of things *within* the buildings, which he held were fraught with harm to the Scottish people. We admit that the Lord James Stewart in the north, and the Earls of Arran and Argyll in the west, 'pulled down' certain ecclesiastical 'monuments' which had been too much associated—even rebelliously so—with the old system. They dreaded the hold of habit on the minds of the ignorant, and conceived this the only way of eliminating such superstitious thoughts and customs. The leaders of Reform at that time believed that what the country required was a plain and simple service which all the people

could follow and from which they could receive benefit. So for them, and for John Knox in particular, that which was old, dusty, and moth-eaten, with its dim religious light, its half-truths and untruths, must depart peremptorily. Perhaps it may be as well to give here the order of the Privy Council of Scotland (somewhat modernised) as to procedure concerning ecclesiastical buildings: 'Our trusty friends after most hearty commendation, we pray you fail not to pass forthwith to the Church of (Dunkeld, or as the case may be) and take down the whole images thereof, and bring them forth to the churchyard and burn them publicly. And similarly cast down the altars and purge the Church of all kinds of monuments of idolatry. And this fail not to do as you will (otherwise) do us singular displeasure—and so (we) commit you to the protection of God.

(Signed) AR. ARGYLE,  
JAMES STUART,  
RUTHVEN.

EDINBURGH, *12th August 1560.*

'Fail not that you take good heed that neither the desks, windows, and doors be any way injured or broken either glazing work or iron work.'

As regards Dunkeld Cathedral, it should be known that, in 1514, Bishop Gavin Douglas laid siege to it, and battered it with his cannon, and after the Battle of Killiecrankie, in 1689, the victorious Highlanders attacked it, for the troops of King William III. had sheltered themselves within its walls, and the stately fane suffered much from the assault.

As regards St Giles' Church, Edinburgh, so much associated with the ministry of John Knox, the civic authorities took in hand the dispenishing of the building. With the help of sailors from Leith, who brought with



them ropes and ladders, the altars were taken down and removed. All the gold and silver, and other valuables, were carefully catalogued and secured, as may be seen from the existing town-records. As for the arm-bone of Giles, or Egidius, the patron-saint, it was stripped of its mountings, and, according to tradition, was thrown into the adjacent graveyard. The building was otherwise uninjured though swept of its Roman Catholic furniture—a pulpit, perhaps a reading desk, and a few benches alone remaining. And, says Dr Donald MacLeod, in his *St Giles Lecture on The Reformation*, although ‘much that was beautiful and reverent may thereby have been sacrificed, the principle was the only logical one by which the popular movement could then have been conducted.’ But *were* things so very beautiful in the churches of Scotland in pre-Reformation days? There are doubts as to that, and Dr Patrick in his *Introduction to the ancient Statutes of the Scottish Church* says that, after a study of them, he would be a bold man who would assume *simpliciter* and insist, as for example Andrew Lang does, that throughout feudal Scotland, the Church—by its decorations, vestments, music—provided an education in things beautiful.

To Knox and his so-called ‘destruction of the monasteries’ may well be applied the following verses of Whittier entitled ‘The Reformer’:

‘ All grim and soiled and brown with tan,  
I saw a strong one, in his wrath,  
Smiting the godless shrines of man,  
Along his path.

“ Spare,” Art implored, “ yon holy pile ;  
That grand, old, time-worn turret spare ”;  
Meek Reverence, kneeling in the aisle,  
Cried out “ Forbear ! ”

Grey-bearded Use, who, deaf and blind,  
 Groped for his old accustomed stone,  
 Leaned on his staff, and wept to find  
     His tent o'erthrown.

Young Romance raised his dreamy eyes,  
 O'erhung with paly locks of gold,—  
 "Why smite," he asked in sad surprise,  
     "The fair, the old?"

Yet louder rang the Strong One's stroke,  
 Yet nearer flashed his axe's gleam,  
 Shuddering and sick of heart I woke,  
     As from a dream.

I looked, aside the dust-cloud rolled,—  
 The Waster seemed the Builder too;  
 Up springing from the ruined old,  
     I saw the New.

'Twas but the ruin of the bad,—  
 The wasting of the wrong and ill;  
 Whate'er of good the old time had,  
     Was living still.

Calm grew the brows of him I feared;  
 The frown which awed me passed away,  
 And left behind a smile which cheered,  
     Like breaking day.

The outworn rite, the old abuse,  
 The pious fraud transparent grown,  
 The good held captive in the use  
     Of wrong alone.—

These wait their doom, from that great law  
 Which makes the past time serve to-day,  
 And fresher life the world shall draw  
     From their decay.

Take heart!—the Waster builds again,  
 A charmed life old Goodness hath;  
 The tares may perish,—but the grain  
     Is not for death.

God works in all things ; all obey  
His first propulsion from the night :  
Wake then and watch :—the world is gray  
With morning light.'

Sir Walter Scott, in *The Monastery*, puts into the mouth of that good man 'Henry Warden' words which might well have come from John Knox. Warden, in addressing the Abbot of Kennaquhair (Melrose) says : 'Peace, William Allan ! for none of these purposes do I come. I would have these stately shrines deprived of the idols which, no longer regarded as the effigies of the good and of the wise, have become the objects of foul idolatry. I would otherwise have its ornaments subsist, unless as they are or may be a snare to the souls of men ; and especially do I condemn those ravages which have been made by the heady fury of the people, stung into zeal against will-worship by bloody persecution. Against such wanton devastations I lift my testimony.' In *The Abbot*, Sir Walter introduces a chaplain—Elias Henderson—who comes to Lochleven and has an interview with the captive Queen. The description of him is that of a man in the prime of life, possessed of good natural parts improved by education, with a faculty of close, terse reasoning, and with the gift of happy illustration and natural eloquence. An earnest promoter of the Protestant faith, there is nothing narrow, boorish, or repellent about him ; and, though occupying but a small space in the story, he is one of the most attractive of the characters in it. We have sometimes thought that the great romancer has here been drawing our Reformer on a small scale.

In addition to the six reasons above submitted for our contention that Knox was a true modern, we may give this other one—*He was a great traveller.*

With the exception of the more northern part of the country, he travelled over nearly the whole of Scotland, and that on various occasions. He was also in journeyings oft in England. He must have known London well. In France we find him at La Rochelle, at Dieppe, and in other parts of that fair land. He resided for some years in Switzerland. In Germany he was located for some months at Frankfort. Few, if any, of the other Reformers travelled so much as Knox, which perhaps made him more cosmopolitan than any of them. Did it not even make him a larger man than most then? In a sense we might say that he combined Luther and Calvin, for while the former was a German of the Germans, plodding and persistent, and the latter essentially French, clear in thought and mentally alert, Knox had both of these characteristics or elements in his nature. While the first-named, too, moved among dignitaries and princes, and the second was more on democratic ground, Knox was on intimate terms with earls and knights, having audiences with rulers of kingdoms, and, as well, was one of the people, moving freely among them and rousing them to the most ardent patriotism and religious fervour. Luther, again, was essentially a man of action, and Calvin more a thinker, but Knox was both. He pondered over religious problems and gave his theories practical application. He thought and wrought out Scotland's freedom.

An estimate of the character and work of John Knox may be gathered from all that precedes, but, as we draw these scenes and incidents to a close, we cannot but say emphatically that courage, determination, and religious ardour were predominant in this Scottish Reformer, and that his work was great and lasting. Those who call him a fanatic have forgotten, or are

unaware of, his shrewdness and good sense, his wit, and his drollery even when situations were serious and themes discussed were of the loftiest. There was in him a singular instinct and passion for the great affairs of a nation, and even of nations. Intensely patriotic, he was also a citizen of the world, deliberating and corresponding on questions affecting foreign states. On his deathbed he said, 'I know that many have complained much and loudly, and do still complain, of my too great severity; but God knows that my mind was always free from hatred to the persons of those against whom I denounced the heavy judgments of God. . . . For a certain reverential fear of my God who called me, and was pleased of His grace to make me a steward of divine mysteries . . . had such powerful effect as to make me utter so intrepidly whatever the Lord had put into my mouth, without any respect of persons.' Egotistic, or egoistic, and arrogant this may seem; but, as it has been observed, egotism and arrogance in this case are to be weighed in mightier scales than the social frailties expressed by such terms. This man wore the mantle of a prophet, and Scotland never before, and never since, has had another such—so brave, so sincere, so commanding. He may have committed himself to extreme positions, and his prejudices may have been many—in those days, however, who was not extreme or prejudiced?—he was self-conscious, self-willed, and dogmatic, but that he was conspicuously brave and sincere surely cannot be doubted. He 'neither feared nor flattered any flesh' in doing his great work. It may be known that after the accession of Mary Tudor to the throne, Knox continued his work in England when nearly all his fellow-labourers had abandoned it; but not so generally known is the fact that, when Mary entered the capital,



Knox was courageous enough to rebuke the crowd for their rejoicings as the Sovereign moved along. The scene is worthy of the artist's brush. Already we have mentioned the 'dag and dagger' dangers that beset him. He was shot at, 'blown to the horn' (that is declared an excommunicated outlaw), was condemned to the flames and burned in effigy in default of the *propria persona*, was warned at St Andrews that if he preached there he would be saluted with culverins, a reward was offered by Mary of Lorraine to any who should seize or kill him, and at the very commencement of his career as a reformer he endured as a slave the horrors of the galleys;<sup>1</sup> but unflinchingly he kept at his task—a 'simple soldier,' as he styles himself—fighting for his great Captain. Yet though a soldier, and stern, even hard at times, there are evidences that he had a heart of tenderness, and could be moved by the deepest feeling. Queen Mary could not 'gar that man greet,' though, as we have seen, other women could draw out the tenderness that was in him. When he was first laid hold of to preach the Gospel, and charged with all solemn adjuration that he *must* do it, feeling the commission too heavy for him—that he was too unworthy to be called to such a work—he burst into tears and withdrew to his chamber. No selfish aggrandisement can ever be urged against him. The age was selfish and deceitful, but Knox, though master and leader of the nation, was altogether unselfish and honest. Hill Burton says that he was 'a simple-minded unsuspecting man. Working with greedy selfish men intent on furthering their own interests, he deemed them to be as completely as himself under the influence of an unselfish religious spirit; and when the evidence of sordidness was all too flagrant, he turned his honest

<sup>1</sup> See Note 3.

eyes on it with surprise, like one who beholds his sober, sedate friend take suddenly to drinking, or go off in a fit of acute madness.'

For strength of will and self-confident faith, only one perhaps in our island story can be named along with him, and that is Oliver Cromwell. And, like the great Protector, our Reformer, as a private individual, as a neighbour, and as husband and father, was beyond reproach. He was beloved and revered by friends and neighbours.<sup>1</sup> Richard Bannatyne, his faithful servitor and amanuensis, who knew him well, called him 'the light of Scotland, the comfort of the Kirk, the mirror and example of all true ministers in purity of life, soundness in doctrine, and boldness in reproving wickedness.' Lest this estimate be considered biassed by warm friendship, take another. There was a quaint writer of those days, Robert Lindesay of Pitscottie—affectionately called 'Auld Pitscottie' by Sir Walter Scott—who, if he did not personally know Knox, (though there is every likelihood he did), doubtless heard some of the sermons he preached at St Andrews and in the east of Fife, where Lindesay's home was. He was much impressed by the teaching of Knox, borrowed, it may be, many words and phrases from him, and when, in his *Chronicles*, he comes to speak of the death of the Reformer, says: 'Johne Knox, minister of Edinburgh, departed of this lyff quhilk was ane gret los and pitie to all thame that favourit Chrystis word. . . . This man was trew feirar (fearer) of Chrystis Evangell in all the process of his lyff . . . all the tyme that he was in this realme he preachit Godis Word and leivit ane godlie lyff all his dayes and endit the samyn maner to the glorie of God and to the re-joyssing of all trew Protestants.' One of a different

<sup>1</sup> See Note 4.

type and, perhaps, still more detached, namely, Thomas Smeaton, a man of great learning who became Principal of Glasgow University, wrote in Latin an account (published in 1579) of the last illness and death of the 'eximius vir, Joannes Knoxius, Scoticanæ Ecclesiæ instaurator,' and there says, 'Nescio an unquam Deus magis pium et majus ingenium in fragili et imbecillo corpore collocavit. . . . Certe in illo rectam tum vivendi tum moriendi regulam quamvis obloquantur prophani Deus nobis demonstravit.' ('I know not if ever God placed in a frail and weak little body a godlier and greater spirit. . . . Surely whatever opprobrious persons say, in him hath God set us an example both of living well and dying well.') Froude, in his *History of England*, says that 'Knox was representative of all that was best in Scotland'; and does the same writer exaggerate when he says: 'No grander figure can be found, in the entire history of the Reformation, than that of Knox?' Not in a boastful spirit, but in defence, he himself said one day, 'Nane haif I corrupted, nane haif I defraudit, merchandize haif I not maid'—and this when many in those strange times reaped a golden harvest through what he had accomplished for his native land. Not an acre of soil fell to this man, nor would he have received any if offered him, and as for loot of Cathedral or Abbey nothing of the kind would he allow to come his way.

That his work was great and lasting all Presbyterian Christendom bears witness to-day; and he made modern Scotland. Wherever he went his influence was remarkable. It has been said that Knox would not have been so much now but for his book, his *History*; but that is pre-eminently no book of rules, theories, ideas, or ideals; it is Knox himself. It is simply the man living himself over again, and coming alongside

of every Scotsman, generation after generation. By his righteous life and his righteous message, he seemed to change everything in his own day. Queen Mary and her counsellors knew that he was the one serious force they had to reckon with. Randolph, in writing to Cecil, puts it tersely: 'Where your Honour exhorteth us to stoutness, I assure you the voice of one man (Knox) is able in one hour to put more lyf in us than fyve hundreth trumpettes continually blustering in our eares.' This personal influence we find working wonders at Geneva, at Dieppe, at Berwick-on-Tweed, in London, in Fifeshire, in Ayrshire, in the Lothians, in the Scottish capital. John Knox changed Scotland. He made modern Scotland, as we have said. He is still making it.

St Columba, when dying, said of Iona and the work for God done there, that 'unto this place, albeit so small and poor, great homage shall yet be paid, not only by the king, and peoples of the Scots, but by the rulers of barbarous and distant nations with their people also.' Something similar, though with more personal note, came from the lips of John Knox as his earthly career was drawing to a close. He said, 'What I have been to my country, albeit this unthankful age will not know, yet the ages to come will be compelled to bear witness to the truth,' and the centuries which have passed since have borne witness that this was a great and a good man, who did splendid service to his native land, and, as a result, to many lands beyond.

## APPENDIX

## NOTE I

## THE MURDER OF RIZZIO

Knox's own words on the terrible deed are: 'And to lett the world understand in plane terms what we meane, that great abusar of this Commonwealth, that pultron and vyle knave Davie, was justlie punished, the nynt of Merch, in the year of God J<sup>m</sup> V<sup>c</sup> three score fyve, for abusing the Commonwealth, and for his other villany, which we list nott to express, by the counsall and handis of James Douglas, Earl of Morton, Patrick Lord Lindesay, and the Lord Ruthven, and otheris assistaris in thare company, who all, for thare just act, and most worthy of all praise, ar now unworthely left of there bretherein, and suffer the bitterness of banishment and exyle.'

Knox thought that these were better men than their successors at Court, whom Queen Mary was now holding in high esteem. Behind the plotting and bloodthirstiness of the deed, he believed that there was a providential judgment, which doubtless was the general feeling at the time. An anonymous writer (supposed to be Sir David Lyndesay) has certain lines referring to the assassination of Cardinal Beaton, and, if we change the word 'Cardinal' to 'Seigneur' we get probably at what people were thinking then of the Rizzio murder, and what a good many have thought of it since:—

' As for the Seigneur, I grant,  
He was a man we weill culd want  
And we'll forget him sune ;  
But yet I think the sooth to say  
Although the loon is weill away  
The deed was foully dune.'

There are those who hold that Knox was an accomplice in the murder, or at least privy to it, but Dr Hume Brown has effectively disposed of all such charges in his *Life of John Knox* (vol. ii. pp. 230, 231), where he says: 'In the atrocious deed of the 9th March, Knox in all probability had neither art nor part. Morton affirmed this, and it was but simple policy on the part of the conspirators that no breath of suspicion should



attach to the chief minister of their religion.' Of the manner in which the deed was done we may be certain that Knox would disapprove as vehemently as any of his contemporaries. From gratuitous bloodshed he shrank with a keenness of feeling which assuredly was not common in his age and country. When Kirkcaldy of Grange asked him if it were permissible to escape from prison by slaying the gaoler, Knox's answer was a stern negative. On the other hand, of the original plan of removing Rizzio by summary trial and execution he would have unconditionally approved. In his eyes, Rizzio had broken the highest law of the land in abetting the mass, and labouring to bring back the Pope. Any trial of him, therefore, could be only to give the wretched man the opportunity of possible repentance. In any event the greatest crime would have been to permit him to live, and imperil the spiritual welfare of the people.' Dr Hume Brown goes farther into the matter in Appendix D (same volume), disposes effectively of Fraser Tytler's so-called incriminating document, and sums up the discussion as follows: 'Valid evidence there is none that Knox had any knowledge of a plot to assassinate Rizzio, or that he approved of the deed as it was actually carried out. But, apart from the question of detailed evidence, is the larger historical question of Knox's attitude towards the general spirit of the Rizzio conspiracy. The aim of Morton and his associates was to remove Rizzio in some such fashion as Cochrane had been removed in the preceding century, and thus to restore the Protestant ascendancy in the country. Of both these acts Knox, beyond a doubt, would have energetically approved. That he had any collusion whatever in the actual execution of the first is not proved by any evidence that is yet to hand.'

Hill Burton's remarks on the matter are as follows:—

'It is still less likely, however, that he (Knox) should have compromised his position as a minister of the Word by either executing or plotting an assassination. Whether, knowing that it was to be done, he would have interrupted it, or would have bidden the perpetrators God-speed, is an idle question, since, with his usual candour, he has left in his *History* his thorough approval of the deed. . . . Much of the accusation and defence wasted on the characters of that age arises from the supposition that, like a well-principled citizen of the present day, anyone hearing of an intended crime was expected to go and inform the police. People in the public world had too much anxiety about

themselves to think of others, and only the strongest personal motive would prompt one to interfere with any act of violence. An attempt to thwart a crime by which his cause would profit, might have justly exposed a man to the charge of insanity or gross duplicity' (*History of Scotland*, vol. iv. pp. 150, 151). Dr Hay Fleming in his *Critical Reviews* (p. 179) also effectively deals with the attempt to implicate Knox in Rizzio's murder, and says that 'the mere fact that Knox's name does not occur in the two long lists of names in the *Register of the Privy Council* is enough to show that he could not be charged with the crime.' His remaining at his post tells in favour of his courage, if not of his innocence, for it has been urged against him that he himself left Edinburgh at the time. The terrible deed, however, having been committed, Knox did approve of it, and, as we have seen, tells us so himself. But surely that is not so bad as the case of the Nuncio of Paris who, in an analogous case, when making known to the Cardinal of Como the plot formed by the Guises for the murder of Queen Elizabeth, writes that he did not intend to tell it to Gregory XIII., for though he believed 'the Pope would be glad that God should punish in any way whatever that enemy of His, still it would be unfitting that His Vicar should procure it by these means.'

## NOTE 2

## THE COVETOUSNESS OF THE SCOTTISH NOBLES

'There was another aspect of the Reformation of which they (the nobles) were eagerly receptive. Eight years earlier, in 1543, Arran had complained to Sadler that the nobles were such firm Papists that they would not admit the Reformation, "unless the sin of covetousness bring them into it." The "sin of covetousness" was destined to play a large part in the history of the Scottish Reformation. Closer diplomatic relations with the wealthy nobility of England and the magnificent court of France had made the Scottish nobles of the sixteenth century bitterly conscious of their poverty. On the question of "teinds" and the scandalous wealth of Churchmen, they were prepared to receive the new teaching with open minds. While this is true of the majority, it is fair to say that there was a minority whose acceptance of the Reformed teaching was the result of sincere conviction. . . . Knox was sanguine indeed when he

expected that the wealth which had kept the old Church in idleness and luxury was to be handed over to keep the new in learning and holiness. Even if the Church's wealth had still been unappropriated, it is certain that the greedy and poverty-stricken nobility would have secured their own share before considering the claims of religion. As it was, much of the property had already passed into the hands of laymen. Some had been frankly confiscated during the civil war. . . . With indignation the Reformers saw them intent on making the most of their bargains, and pressing the tenants as cruelly as ever their old masters had done.'—*John Knox*, by Florence A. Maccunn.

'In that year (1572) the Church, along with the State, was entering into a very curious experiment. The object was to get some arrangement effected, in virtue of which the patrimony of the Kirk, or some of it, might be applied to religious uses. The distribution of that patrimony, in moderate incomes, to the various labourers throughout the country was desired by the Church; but difficulties were made by the State. The great benefices, it was said, must be kept up—ostensibly on legal and constitutional grounds—really in order that there might be good fat geese for the nobles to pluck.'—*Three Lectures on the Church of Scotland*, by Robert Rainy, D.D.

'The impecuniosity of the Scottish nobles is the simple and adequate explanation of the devious public career of not a few of them.'—*Scotland in the Time of Queen Mary*, by P. Hume Brown, LL.D.

This continued appropriation of land and revenue on the part of the nobles was expressively called a 'birsing yont.' In the posthumous (1898) *Historical Sketches* of Thomas Carlyle, edited by Alexander Carlyle, B.A., we have the following: 'Those old church-lands, seized with an unspeakable coolness by hungry Vicekings or Aristocracy here, when the nation set about reforming its religion: had the hungry Vicekings before all men the clear right then? A cooler stroke of legislator trade I have not seen anywhere—nor had my friend Knox seen anywhere. Majesty (James VI. in 1617, while on his visit to Scotland) thinks the Head King might as well have these lands back again to himself (and schemes accordingly, and his son Charles I. carries out the project). So the biter is bit, and bit severely.'

## NOTE 3

## KNOX AND THE FRENCH GALLEYS

The life, or rather living death, in the galleys is not realisable by us now, though there is a faint echo of it in the now meaningless phrase—‘to work like a galley-slave.’ Massino d’Azeglio, in the fourteenth chapter of his grave and stately historical novel *Niccolo de’ Lapi*, gives some indication of its awfulness. A recent Scottish historian, however, says that Knox’s hardships were not very great in the galleys. It is true that Knox and his fellow-captives were clearly intended to fill up serious blanks which the siege of St Andrews had made in the crews. Calderwood (vol. i. p. 239) says, ‘They (that is to say, the French) lost manie of their rowers, men chained to the galeyes.’ Of course the soldiers on board could not, unless under punishment for grave offences, be made to take the rowers’ places. Now, as men who, most of them at least, had perhaps never previously handled a boat oar, much less a galley oar, Knox and his companions could not, from the nature of the case, have been made to work hard at first, and the efforts which were made at an early stage in their confinement to win them over to Roman Catholicism were obviously incompatible with great rigour; but the Roman Catholics of Scotland were plainly of opinion that Knox and the others were being let off too easily, and Rome was equally stern. Says Calderwood (vol. i. page 241), ‘The Pope gave thanks to the King of France and our governour for the revenge of the slaughter of his kinde creature the Cardinall, and desired them to continue in their severitie, lest the like thing sould be attempted after. A famous clerk, Mr Johne Hammilton of Milburne, who had neither Frenche, nor Latine, nor good Scotish language, was sent to the King of France and the Cardinall of Lorraine to desire that the captives sould be sharpelie handled. He was heard with favour, and was dispatched home againe with letters and great credite.’ These exhortations from Rome and remonstrances from Scotland had clearly great effect on King Henry the Second and his naval officers, for Calderwood subsequently says (vol. i. page 242), ‘When the galeyes returned to Scotland, and were lying betwixt Dundie and Sanct Andrewes, Johne Knox being so sicke that few had anie hope of his recoverie, etc.’ Calderwood does

not seem to exaggerate in the least when he says that Knox and the rest of the prisoners in the galleys were 'miserably entreated.'

Tytler, when stating that 'others, including the reformer (Knox) himself, were kept chained on board the galleys, and treated with the utmost rigour' refers to Lesley's (a Roman Catholic bishop's) History for his authority. It might perhaps be urged that as Knox had time, as appears to be the case, during his stay in the galleys to write a treatise in defence of Protestantism, he could not have been put to any severe or constant work; but he could easily have written that treatise while the galleys were lying in the river Loire during the winter.

## NOTE 4

## KNOX A PRUDENT HOUSEHOLDER

His Will, among other things, shows this. He was evidently a good business man, and his Will is drawn up in a business-like way. He says in it: 'None I have corrupted, none have I defrauded, merchandize have I not made . . . of the glorious Evangel of Jesus Christ.' In the testamentary part we see exhibited a careful management of secular affairs, the lack of which in some spiritually-minded people injures themselves and others. The debts 'owing to the dead' amounted to £830 Scots (=£166 sterling). The debts 'owing by the dead=none.' To his sons, Nathanael and Eleazar (at that time students at Cambridge), he left, as a precious remembrance 'that same benediction that their dearest mother, Marjorie Bowes, left unto them . . . that God would make them his true worshippers; whereto, now as then, I from my troubled heart say Amen.' Their mother's fortune of 100 merks sterling (=£66, 13s. 4d.), augmented by his care to £500 Scots (=£100), was left to these two sons, also certain articles of plate, among them two silver goblets with J. K. M. on one side, and on the other E. B. N. The rest of his property was left to his wife, Margaret Stewart, and his three daughters, Martha, Margaret, and Elizabeth; including the debts owing to him it amounted to £1526 Scots (=£305 sterling), and books valued at £130 Scots (=£26 sterling). There was also a legacy of 'ane hundreth pundis qlk lyis in wodset' to a nephew Paul Knox for his education. His wife



and daughters were appointed executors, and relying on the tried generosity of the people of Edinburgh, he simply nominates 'the faithful to be oversmen' (trustees), and they faithfully carried out the trust. Moreover, the Town Council continued his stipend to his wife and children for the year following his death. His stipend had been 200 merks Scots (=£10, 16s. 8d. sterling) to begin with, but had been gradually augmented to 500 merks Scots (£27, 1s. 8d sterling)—a liberal provision for those days, and he had a free furnished house. From various references at the time Knox appears to have lived in kindness and friendliness with his neighbours, acting upon that motto which runs along the frieze over the street floor of his house :—

'LVFE . GOD . ABOVE . AL . AND . YI . NIGHTBOVR . AS . YI .  
SELF.'

We have seen how the Edinburgh people held him in the highest esteem and affection, and we have given one or two extracts from the Burgh Records in proof thereof. Let us now add the following, showing how the Town Council, as representing the citizens, ministered to his wants :—

' 8th May, 1560. The Provost, Bailies, and Council ordain Alexander Park, their Treasurer, to deliver to John Carins £40 for furnishing to their minister John Knox in his household.'  
' 15th May, 1560. The Provost, Bailies, and Council ordain the Treasurer to pay twenty shillings for making the keys of the Cowgate Port, ane for a lock to John Knox's lodging.'  
' 30th October, 1560. The Provost, Bailies, and Council ordain James Barrow to content and pay to John Knox the sum of six score pounds of the readiest money of the Town being in his hands, and such-like the sum of £20 for iron and fire work furnished to his house.'  
' 5th November, 1561. The Provost, Bailies, and Council ordain the Dean of Guild with all diligence to make a warm study of deals to the minister John Knox, within his Lodgings, above the hall of the same, with lights and windows thereunto, and all other necessities.'  
' 19th November, 1568. The Provosts, Bailies, and Council ordain the Treasurer to cause repair the necessities of John Knox's dwelling-house.'  
The above sums are in Scots money.

The following minute shows how unanimously and strongly the Town Council supported Knox in a contest with the Queen :  
' 23 August, 1565. The Provost, Council, and Deacons of Crafts ordain John Sym, David Forester, and Allan Dickson, Bailies, Master Robert Glen, Treasurer, James Nicholl and William

Fowler, of the Council, this afternoon to pass to the King's and Queen's Majesties (Lord Darnley and Queen Mary) desiring to be heard of them touching the discharging of John Knox, minister, of further preaching, and the deposing of Archibald Douglas, Provost, and to report their answer in the morn.

The same day, afternoon, the Bailies, Council, and Deacons foresaid, being convened in the Council House, after long reasoning upon the discharging of John Knox, minister, of preaching during the King's and Queen's Majesties' being in this town, all in one voice conclude that they will no manner of way consent that his mouth be closed in preaching the True Word, and therefore willeth him at his pleasure, as God should move his heart, to proceed forward in True Doctrine as he has been of before, which Doctrine they would approve and abide at to their life's end.'

In the present writer's *John Knox and Ayrshire*, there is a document which also might be inserted here, as it shows the love and esteem borne to him by another Scottish municipality, namely, the Town Council of Ayr. The document is of six years' later date than the preceding, and was transmitted to Edinburgh when Kirkcaldy of Grange held the Castle there, and was making things uncomfortable for Knox, even threatening his life. It is a letter of remonstrance to Kirkcaldy:—

'Sir,—After hartlie commendatioune in the Lord; For sa meikle as unto this our Assemblie at Ayre, the secund of Januare, we have hard be report of some, that not only ye have conceived ane offence against our brother, Johne Knox, but also that are purposit to injure him be sum way of died (a thing hard to be believed of us); For albeit in materis of civile regiment ye dae not fullie agrie with us, yit in the actione of relijoine God hes heirtofore sa far used your labouris to the fartherance thair of, that ye have not bene a simple professore only, but also a chiefe defender thair of, with the hasard of your lyfe, landis, and guides: And, thairfoir, hard it is to persuade us that ye should be movit to dae ony harme to him in whose protectione and lyfe (to our judgment) standis the prosperitie and increase of Godis Kirke and relijione, and so, be the injureing of him, to cast down that worke which with so grit labouris and manifold dangeris ye have helpit to build. Yit, nochtheless, the grit cair that we have of the personage of that man, whom God has made both the first planter and also the chief waterer of His Kirke among us, moves us to write these few lynis unto you, protestine that

the death and lyfe of that our said brother is to us so pretious and deer as is our owin lyves and deathis. Desyrine to have a plaine declaretion of your mynd in this matter with this beirar, whom we have directed unto you with further credite. And this nocht trubling you with farder anything, we committ you to the regiment of the Spreit of God.—From Ayre the 3 of Januare, 1571.'

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Knox's *History of the Reformation in Scotland*.  
 Calderwood's *History of the Kirk of Scotland*.  
 Row's *History of the Kirk of Scotland*.  
 Spottiswood's *History of the Church of Scotland*.  
 M'Crie's *Life of John Knox*.  
 Hume Brown's *John Knox*.  
*Dictionary of National Biography*. Article, 'John Knox.'  
*Encyclopædia Britannica*. Article, 'John Knox.'  
 Lord Guthrie's *John Knox and his House*.  
 Peter Miller's *John Knox and his Manse*.  
 Laing's *The Works of John Knox*.  
 Hay Fleming's *Mary Queen of Scots*.  
     "      "      *The Reformation in Scotland*.  
     "      "      *Critical Reviews*.  
     "      "      *Handbook of St Andrews and Neighbourhood*.  
 Hume Brown's *Scotland in the Time of Queen Mary*.  
 Mitchell's *The Scottish Reformation*. Baird Lecture.  
 Hastie's *Theology of the Reformed Church in its Fundamental Principles*. Croall Lecture.  
 Lindsay's *History of the Reformation*.  
*The Memorials of Richard Bannatyne*. Bannatyne Club.  
*Diurnal of Occurrents*. Bannatyne Club.  
*Book of the Universal Kirk*. Bannatyne Club.  
*Buchanan's Rerum Scoticarum Historia*.  
 Aikman's Translation of *Buchanan's History*.  
 Bishop Leslie's *History of Scotland*. Scottish Text Society.  
 Pitcottie's *Chronicles of Scotland*. Scottish Text Society.  
 Keith's *History of the Affairs of Church and State in Scotland*.  
 Cunningham's *Church History of Scotland*.  
 MacEwen's *History of the Church in Scotland*.  
 Ninian Hill's *Story of the Scottish Church*.  
 Grub's *Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*.

- Tytler's *History of Scotland*.  
 Hill Burton's *History of Scotland*.  
 Andrew Lang's *History of Scotland*.  
 Hume Brown's *History of Scotland*.  
 Froude's *History of England*. (Vols. vi.-x.)  
 „ *Influence of the Reformation on the Scottish Character*,  
 in his *Short Studies on Great Subjects*. (Vol. i.)  
 Lorimer's *John Knox and the Church of England*.  
*The Cambridge Modern History*. (Vol. ii., The Reformation).  
*Catholic Tractates*. Scottish Text Society.  
 Winzet's *Certain Tractates*. Scottish Text Society.  
 Mitchell's *Gude and Godlie Ballatis*. Scottish Text Society.  
 Marwick's *Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Edinburgh*.  
 Patrick's *Statuta*. Scottish History Society.  
 Bain's *Calendar of State Papers*.  
*Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*.  
 Sir David Lyndsay's *Poetical Works*. Edited by David Laing,  
 LL.D.  
 Anderson's *Collections relating to the history of Mary, Queen of  
 Scots*.  
 Forbes Leith's *Narratives of Scottish Catholics under Mary  
 Stewart and James I*.

## SUBSIDIARY

- Taylor Innes's *Knox* ; Maccunn's *Knox* ; Macmillan's *Knox* ;  
 Stalker's *Knox* ; Glasse's *Knox* ; Cowan's *Knox*.

## CHAPTER III

### JOHN WILLOCK

JOHN WILLOCK, according to Professor Hume Brown, 'seems to have held the next place in name and authority to Knox among the preachers of the reformed religion in Scotland.' He was a native of Ayrshire, if not of the town of Ayr. There are families of that name to-day in the county town who claim descent from, or at least connection with, him. A member of one of these was recently Provost of Ayr. We know nothing of Willock's parentage, but as a youth he was apparently sent to Glasgow University, and thereafter we find him as a friar in the Franciscan monastery of Ayr.<sup>1</sup> As he certainly was there previous to the year 1540—and assuming his age to be about twenty-five then—he must have been born somewhere about the year 1516. We can picture his life among the Franciscans. Not so richly endowed nor so old as its near neighbour, the monastery of the Dominican or Black Friars, the Franciscan monastery was pleasantly situated on the banks of the River Ayr, where the present old church stands. We have only one trace of it to-day, namely the 'Friars' Well,' which the churchyard wall now covers, but whence water can still be seen oosing out. John Willock would wear the grey cloak of his order, and, perhaps, would be seen at times assisting in the cultivation of the fruit trees and vegetables which grew in the rich soil of the monastery

<sup>1</sup> See Note I.



garden, or casting the fly or hauling the net in the river below. The Dominicans had the sole right to the salmon fishings, but doubtless they would extend their courtesy to the brethren who lived so near them.

That the friars of Ayr were a merry company, delighting in hospitality, is evident from the fact that no item occurs more regularly in the town's accounts than 'a hogheid of wyne to the Gray Frers.' But they had their religious exercises also, and within the Franciscan monastery was an image of the Virgin renowned for wonder-working powers.

To this monastic institution, then, Willock for some time belonged, but the day came when he left the convent and cast off the monastic habit for ever. The new opinions seized hold of him, and he became an ardent Protestant. That he had been a Franciscan is noteworthy, for in changing his opinions he proved an exception to his order. While many of the Augustinian canons and Dominican friars warmly espoused the doctrines of the Reformation, few Franciscans, Cistercians, Benedictines, or Carmelites did so. We have no means of knowing what brought about the change in Willock—whether it was by converse with some earnest soul of the new faith, by reading some treatise on the subject, or by direct light received from the Holy Scriptures—but once converted he was not slow to announce to others the new truths he had received. He did not do this at first in the town of Ayr; but, anticipating, we may say that when he began the work of reform in Ayr, his labours were attended with conspicuous success. Crowds flocked to hear him in the church of St John, and when they departed from the sacred building, it was with grim determination to destroy all semblances and relics of the old system. They cleared the two monasteries of

their images and of their friars, but that they were not altogether ruthless is proved by the fact that, as the town records inform us, two at least of the friars had annual pensions bestowed upon them, as had also two of the former chaplains of St John's Church. Possibly all the others had embraced Protestantism. The burghers were jubilant over their success, and the magistrates fêted John Willock as the hero of the fight. Among their disbursements at the time we find—'wyne to John Willock.' In addition to the burghers, Willock had help from a large band of noblemen and gentlemen of the shire, who attended him with their servants and retainers, and pledged themselves to protect him, greatly to the chagrin of Archbishop Beaton, who would fain have laid hands on him. When these same noblemen—the Earl of Glencairn, Lord Boyd, Lord Ochiltree, and others—marched from Ayrshire to Perth to assist the Reformers there, they took Willock with them. In referring to this, Knox says, 'With the Earl of Glencairn came our loving brother, John Willock.'

Our reformer seems to have gone to England immediately on doffing the monastic habit. In all likelihood he felt he would be safer there, for the King, Henry VIII., had broken with the old church. At first, however, Willock had to endure hardness in that country, for he was thrown into the Fleet prison in connection with the persecution for the Six Articles. There had been passed, in the year 1539, 'an Act for abolishing diversity of opinion in certain Articles of the Christian Religion,' and this oppressive measure, known as the Statute of the Six Articles, pressed heavily on the Protestants. Soon, however, Willock's ability and force of character asserted themselves, and when Edward VI. came to the throne he was appointed chaplain to the Duke of Suffolk, father of Lady Jane

Grey. We find him, also, a preacher at St Catherine's Church, London. Foxe, in his *Book of Martyrs*, mentions Willock (though the name is erroneously printed 'Wilcock') as connected with the parish of St Catherine, and speaks of him as suffering persecution. He says, 'Willock, a Scottish friar, was prisoner in the Fleet for preaching against confession, holy water, against praying to saints, and for souls departed : against purgatory, and holding priests might have wives,' etc., and the martyrologist also says that one of the charges against a William Clinch, of the parish of St John the Baptist, Walbrook, was for 'burying his wife without dirge, and causing the Scot of St Catherine's to preach the next day after the burial.'

Willock was one of the preachers who held a particular licence from the English Government, by which he was not restricted to any one place, but was empowered to traverse the country and preach wherever it seemed good to him. His compatriot, John Knox, had also this licence, and one day the latter wrote as follows to Mrs Bowes :—' I nicht be mair diligent in going fra place to place although I suld beg and preache Chryst.' There is a reference to Willock in Bullinger's dedication, in Latin, of his Fifth Decade to the Marquis of Dorset, where he says, 'Your piety needs none of my teaching, seeing that it is surrounded with most learned and godly men on all sides, of whom Master Robert Skinner and Master John Willock, very excellent men, are none of the least.' In the following lines we have the Reformer's praise celebrated by Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich :—

' Quid memorem quanta Wilocus, Skinerus et Haddon  
 Ælmerusque tuos ornarint luce penates ?  
 O Deus ! O quales juvenes ! Quo principe digni !  
 His tua luminibus splendet domus.'

(Strype's *Annals*, ii., Append., p. 46.)

This Marquis of Dorset, afterwards Duke of Suffolk, became very friendly towards Willock and had him appointed his domestic chaplain for several years at Bradgate, the family seat, near Leicester. In an interesting letter from Willock to Bullinger (*Zurich Collection*), written from Oxford on May 12th, 1552, the writer expresses his grateful feelings for the kind words in the dedication, and also refers to his patron, the Marquis. The letter is as follows: 'Health in Christ. I came over to Oxford on the 11th of May, which as soon as John ab Ulmis knew, he has never ceased asking me, most excellent sir, to send you a letter. I wrote you soon after Christmas, but knew not whether my letter had ever reached you, I will, therefore, only at present briefly touch upon the heads of what I then wrote. First of all, everlasting thanks for the kindness by which you were induced to make such affectionate mention of me in your dedicatory preface to our Prince (the Marquis of Dorset). I have ever admired your universally acknowledged learning and erudition. The Prince certainly received that little present of yours with a most grateful and well-disposed mind; and you must know that you have not acted more honourably than usefully and piously; for, as Socrates says, the exhortation of great men are as a whip and spur to happy perseverance in a praiseworthy course of life. Every night, when we were employed on the Scottish borders, after the book had been received there from John ab Ulmis, with great difficulty on his part, his Highness was not satisfied with having a large portion of your book merely read to him, but would have it diligently examined, by which I perceived him, endued as he was with a most excellent disposition, greatly to improve; and indeed he very often expressed himself greatly obliged to you for it.'

When Willock was in England the Duke of Suffolk<sup>1</sup> presented him to the living of Loughborough, in Leicestershire, which living he appears to have retained all through his life; and, as he afterwards became a minister of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland, he would have the unique distinction of being, at the same time, a beneficed clergyman of the Church of England. The Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Glasgow University—Dr Cooper—has indeed said (in a *Scottish Review* article, 1914), that when Rector of Loughborough, John Willock journeyed to Scotland to be Moderator of four General Assemblies. The fact, or at least statement, is a remarkable one, and possibly few readers of Scottish—and also of English—Church history are aware of it. We are not sure if Willock actually ‘came down’ from England to preside at all these four meetings of the Supreme Court, but there appears to be no doubt that he actually was Rector of Loughborough when he occupied the chair of the Assembly.

On the accession of Mary to the throne of England, in July 1553, Willock escaped from that country, and crossed over to Emden, in Friesland, where, at an early stage, ruler and people had eagerly embraced the cause of Protestantism. We find him practising in that country as a physician, prospering in his profession, and rising to a position of influence. Anna, the Duchess of Friesland, recognised his ability and tact, and appointed him commissioner to Scotland to negotiate on matters of trade with the Queen-Regent.

Twice he visited Scotland on this mission, in 1555

<sup>1</sup> As will be seen from a note in the appendix, the presentation has been credited to Henry, Earl of Huntingdon, but it may have been made at the request, or through the influence, of the Duke of Suffolk.



and 1556, and then, in 1558, he finally left Emden and settled in his native land. Knox says, as we shall see, that Willock's principal purpose in accepting the Duchess of Friesland's commission, was to see what work God had for him to perform in the land of his birth. He soon attained to a prominent place among the Scottish reformers; indeed, one would almost suppose from a letter written to James Beaton, Archbishop of Glasgow, by Quintin Kennedy, that Knox himself played a secondary part to him. At any rate, in this letter, written on 7th April 1559, we are told that the Scottish Protestants had chosen Willock as 'Primat of their religioun.' This Quintin Kennedy was himself an Ayrshire man, belonged to the Franciscan order, and had become Abbot of Crossraguel. In all likelihood he was personally acquainted with Willock, and it was the latter whom he selected in the first instance to do battle with on points of controversy between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. As still further indicating the prominent place occupied by Willock in the Scottish Reformation, a poem written in those days may be quoted. It is not to be forgotten that the fierce struggle between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism—with avarice and tyranny among the nobles, uprisings among the commons, and corruption and immorality everywhere prevailing—supplied balladists and satirists with many themes. Consequently we have in rhyme rough and ready pictures of passing events, satirical effusions directed against men prominent in secular or sacred affairs, and at times ebullitions of spite, rancour, and personal abuse. There were many of these poetical broadsheets and leaves printed in black letter, and hawked about the country by chapmen and pedlars. While most of them are by Protestants, a few are by Roman Catholics,

and among the latter is one anonymous as regards its author and printer and the place from which it was issued, but with the date 1581, and bearing the title 'Ane Admonition To The Antichristian Ministers in The Deformit Kirk of Scotland.' The following are the lines referring to Willock, and they indicate the leading place he occupied among the Scottish Reformers :

' Sen for loun Willox to be zour crounal strang, (colonel)  
 Quhais heid and schoulders ar of bouk aneuch, (bulk)  
 That was in Scotland vyreenin zou amang, (consorting)  
 Quhen as he drave and Knox held steve the pleuch.' (firmly)  
 (plough)

Are we to infer from this effusion that John Willock was a Saul among the prophets, a man of large physical build? One would think so.

As is well known Knox was obnoxious to Queen Elizabeth, and she would never admit him to the royal presence. But Willock appears to have had that privilege and honour. It came about in this way. When the French army in Scotland was annoying and alarming the reformers—the situation, indeed, was almost desperate—the leaders of the Congregation dispatched Maitland of Lethington to London in order to try and secure assistance from the English statesmen. But Lethington did not go alone, for the *Sadleyr Papers* inform us that he was accompanied by Willock or Balnaves, or by both. Nor had they only an interview with Cecil and other ministers of State, but they laid the matter before Queen Elizabeth herself. What precisely their proposals were we do not know, but the remarkable fact emerges that, as Teulet tells us, the delegates offered, 'se donner' to her majesty, and proposed a union of Scotland with England 'under the ancient name of Great Britain.'

Knox's first reference to Willock in his *History* is as

follows : ' First came a simple man, William Harlaw, whose erudition, although it excel not, yet for his zeal, and diligent plainness in doctrine, is he to this day worthy of praise, and remains a fruitful member within the Church of Scotland (as minister of the Parish of St Cuthbert's Edinburgh). After him came that notable man, John Willock, as one who had some commission to the Queen-Regent from the Duchess of Emden. But his principal purpose was to essay what God would work by him in his native country. These two did sometimes, in several companies, assemble the brethren, who by their exhortations began greatly to be encouraged, and did show that they had an earnest thirst for godliness. Last came John Knox to Scotland, in the end of the harvest, in the year of God 1555.' Knox then tells us that there repaired to him (Knox) at his lodgings in Edinburgh, ' in the house of that notable man of God, James Syme,' Erskine of Dun and some leading citizens, when they held conferences on the work of reform. Had Knox and Willock met before they became fellow-workers in Scotland? We think so. In the letter to the Marquis of Dorset, already given, Willock refers to his employment on the Scottish borders, and also to a friend of his named John ab Ulmis. This latter was a Swiss student, who had been studying at Oxford, and he informs Bullinger, in a letter from London, of the year 1551, that the Marquis of Dorset ' is gone into Scotland with three hundred cavalry, and some good preachers, with the view of faithfully instructing and enlightening in religion that part of the country which had been subdued during the last few years. I think of joining them there in a few weeks.' Ab Ulmis did go to Berwick, and on his return he writes : ' Willock is preaching the Word of God with much labour on the borders of Scotland.' Now Knox was in

Berwick at that time as minister of the Protestant Congregation, preaching also and labouring 'on the borders of Scotland.' There were important negotiations with England taking place at Berwick, in which many leading Scotsmen took part, and it is inconceivable that Knox and Willock, for whom these negotiations meant so much, would not be in that important town at the same time, and have a good deal of personal intercourse. They would doubtless also meet in their preaching tours in the neighbourhood.

Knox's second reference to Willock is as follows. The year is 1556, and he says: 'At last, at God's good pleasure, arrived John Willock the second time from Emden, whose return was so joyful to the brethren that their zeal and godly courage daily increased. Albeit he contracted a dangerous sickness, yet he ceased not from his labours, but taught and exhorted from his bed. Some of the nobility—of whom some are fallen back, among whom the Lord Seton is chief—with many barons and gentlemen, were his auditors, and by him were godly instructed and wondrously comforted. They kept their conventions, and held counsels with such gravity and closeness that the enemies trembled.' And their zeal for the Evangel affected the whole population, so that 'images' were removed from churches, and 'that great idol St Giles was first drowned in the North Loch, and after burned, which raised no small trouble in the town. For the friars, rowping (crying hoarsely) like ravens upon the bishops, the bishops ran upon the Queen,' and endeavoured to get her to stamp out this revolution.

According to Pitscottie, the Regent Moray (then Lord James Stewart) had a hand in securing the services of Willock. 'At this time,' he says, 'Lord James with adwyce of the Congregation brocht Johne Knox out of

Geneve and Johne Willox out of England, quha war bayth Scottismen borne, and cunning men in the Scripture of God and trew precharis of Chrystis Evangell, quha was banisit out of Scotland befor for the samyn and judgment led in thame be David Beattoun Cardinall for the tyme quho causit to condamp thame for arracie and burne thair picturis. Nochtwithstanding thay was so presarvit be Goddis graice, and the said Cardinall gat his reward for the said banishment and that be the hand of God for puniching of his trew servandis.'

Some time after this we find Willock in Dundee. He is still in poor health, but in that town, and soon again in Edinburgh, he works so indefatigably and with such success that Knox feels mightily encouraged and strengthened. Knox would even accord him the honour of starting the Reformation in Scotland, or at least of giving it a fresh impetus, for he says that it was through his preaching at Edinburgh and Dundee that the brethren began to 'deliberate on some public reformation.' In 1559 an important but dangerous position was given him, namely, that of minister of St Giles'. It was thought better that Knox should retire for a little, partly for the purpose of advancing the cause of reform in other parts of the country, and partly for his own safety. It would appear that Willock had some commendable qualities that were lacking in the great Reformer. Dr M'Crie, in contrasting him with Knox, says that he surpassed the latter in affable address, which enabled him to accomplish his purposes when his intrepid colleague could not act with safety or success. Willock, therefore, was chosen for this important office, though the appointment was evidently intended to be only of a temporary nature. He had the Duke of Chatelherault at times



in his audience, and others of high station. He dispensed the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in St Giles' Church, and this is generally understood to be the first time this sacrament was publicly dispensed in Edinburgh in the Protestant fashion. From a letter of Kirkcaldy of Grange to Sir Henry Percy we learn that the Service Book used was the *Second Prayer Book of Edward VI.* We also know from the old records of the Town Council of Edinburgh that there was an 'actour of the morning prayeris,' elsewhere in the records called 'redar of the common prayeris.' We know what John Willock's stipend was, for in the same records we read: '29th August 1560.—The Counsaill ordains their treasurer to deliver to John Willock twenty-two crownes of the sone (sun) for recompense of the great traveil sustenit by him this haill yiere bygane, in preching and administering the sacramentis within this burgh, and ordains ane member of the Counsaill to thank him for his greit benevolence, and for his greit travaill forsaid.' They also appear to have paid the minister's rent or lodgings. Later, in 'The compt. of Sir John Wyisharte, Knycht Comptroller and Collector-General of the Thredis of the Benefices of the Realme, 1564,' we read: 'And to Johne Willock, xviiij day of September, zeir the lxiiij, deliverit the soume of fourtye pundis at my Lord Comptrollaris command, in part of payment of his stipend, as his acquittance beris.'

Here is what Knox says of the minister :—

'For the comfort of the brethren, and continuance of the Kirk in Edinburgh, was left there our dear brother John Willock, who, for his faithful labours and bold courage in that battle, deserveth immortal praise. For, when it was found dangerous that John Knox, who before (on 7th July 1559) was elected minister to that church, should continue there, the brethren requested

the said John Willock to abide with them, lest that for lack of ministers, idolatry should be erected up again. To the which he so gladly consented, that it might evidently appear that he preferred the company of his brethren, and the continuance of the church there, to his own life.'

Certainly the dangers were great. The Queen-Regent was in possession of the city; the French troops lay in garrison at Leith, and in the Canongate; the royal party were doing all in their power to have the Mass celebrated again in St Giles'; the Earl of Huntly was using his influence for the Queen's party among the citizens; and the French soldiers were even disturbing the Protestant service—'walking up and down,' says a later historian, 'behind the hearers with such talking and noise as disturbed the people very much.' It should be remembered that in the Church of St Giles at that time, while stalls within the choir accommodated clergymen and nobles, the great central area and the aisles were unencumbered with galleries or pews, though portable stools, as later in Jenny Geddes's time, were utilised by the city dames. The French soldiers accordingly made the area and aisles a place of promenade during the time of service to the great annoyance of the congregation. Willock denounced these disturbers in no measured terms from the pulpit, and prayed that 'the land might soon be freed from such locusts.' Sometimes a Romish churchman would intrude himself, and Calderwood tells us that one day, when Willock was preaching, 'a horned cap was taken off a proud priest's head, and cut in four quarters because he said he would wear it in spite of the congregation.'

Willock did not flinch in carrying on his work. Later, the Queen had him summoned before the Court of

Justiciary to stand his trial for heresy, and when he, and some other preachers, refused to appear, they were declared rebels, and their cautioners subjected to heavy fines. But the tables were soon turned, the Lords of the Congregation prevailed, and Willock had to pronounce sentence on the Queen. The matter arose in this way. The Queen having broken faith with the Protestant leaders, and having commenced to fortify Leith, a convention of the nobility, barons, and burghers was held in the Tolbooth of Edinburgh to take into consideration her conduct, and it was Willock who was asked first to give his judgment. He gave it as his opinion that she 'might justly be deprived of the government.' According to Spottiswood, John Willock said: 'That albeit magistracy be God's ordinance, and that they who bear rule have their authority from Him, yet their power is not so largely extended, but that the same is bounded and limited by God in His Word. And albeit God hath appointed magistrates His lieutenants on earth, honouring them with His own title, and calling them gods; yet did He never so establish any, but for just causes they might be deprived. For even as subjects are commanded to obey their magistrates, so magistrates have direction given them for their behaviour towards them they rule, and God in His Word hath defined the duties both of the one and the other. In deposing princes and those that have borne authority, God did not always use His immediate power, but sometimes he used other means, such as in His Wisdom He thought good. As by Asa He removed Maacha his own mother from the honour and authority which before she did exercise; by Jehu He destroyed Joram and the whole posterity of Achab; and by divers others He deposed from the Government those whom He had established before by His own Word.

Since the Queen-Regent had denied her chief duty to the subjects of the realm, which was to minister justice indifferently, to preserve them from the invasion of strangers, and to suffer the Word of God to be freely preached, seeing also she was a minister of superstition, and despised the counsel of the nobility, he did think they might deprive her from all regiment and authority over them.'

There were certain provisos added, and Knox seconded Willock, with the result that the Queen's authority was suspended and a council appointed to manage the affairs of the kingdom until a meeting of Parliament. Willock was chosen to assist in their deliberations, and in this way became a Privy Councillor.

It was not long after this that Mary of Lorraine sickened unto death. The Earls of Argyll and Glencairn, the Earl Marischal, and Lord James Stewart were summoned to her bedside, and each conversed with her. They suggested that she should 'send for a godly, learned man of whom she might receive instruction, for the ignorant Papists that were about her understood nothing of the Mystery of the Redemption,' and it was not John Knox but John Willock who was sent for. The Queen entered into conversation with him, and he spoke faithfully, and doubtless also tenderly to her; and Knox says 'that she did openly confess that there was no salvation but in and by the death of Jesus Christ.' It must have been a strange scene, this royal death-bed, the Protestant reformer ministering to the spiritual needs of a prominent Roman Catholic, who had endeavoured to put down the new faith and imprison the very man who was now her spiritual adviser. Many artists have painted scenes connected with Mary, Queen of Scots, and John Knox, but surely there is also material for the artist in this

scene in Edinburgh Castle between her mother and John Willock.

It may be mentioned that Willock, some five years later, had an interview also with her famous daughter, and thus he appears to have been the only one of 'the six Johns' who had this double honour and responsibility.

But, going back some eight years, there was another almost royal lady, proclaimed indeed Queen of England, with whom John Willock was on terms of closest intimacy, and that was Lady Jane Grey. Bradgate, already referred to, the seat of the Duke of Suffolk, was her home, and Willock, who was located there for several years, was the pastor and teacher of this amiable, accomplished, and unfortunate lady. It is said that it was he who, in the first instance, taught her to think so highly of Bullinger, whose correspondent she became, and that he influenced her in favour of the Helvetic type of the reformed faith.

In the year 1560, John Willock, along with several others, was appointed by the Committee of Parliament a Superintendent. Ten were originally contemplated for this office, but there were never more than five. The part of Scotland Willock was to superintend was 'the West,' which included his native shire of Ayr. Glasgow was to be his head-quarters. These Superintendents were necessary for the Presbyterian Church in its beginnings, and were different from diocesan bishops, inasmuch as they were answerable for all they did to the General Assembly, and they had no special powers such as of ordination. One of them was a layman, of ancient lineage and wealthy, John Erskine of Dun, who was appointed Superintendent of Angus and Mearns. That John Knox meant by this Superintendence something quite different from Anglican Episcopacy



is proved by, among other things, his refusal in 1572 to inaugurate Master John Douglas, who had been chosen Archbishop of St Andrews; and just as other temporary officials such as 'Readers' and 'Exhorters' soon passed away, so also did 'Superintendents.' The induction of Willock to this office must have been considered of State importance, for Thomas Randolph, the English Ambassador, writes about it to Secretary Cecil in London, and he mentions among those present the Duke of Chatelherault, his son the Earl of Arran, the Earl of Glencairn, Lord Ruthven, Lord Boyd, and Lord Ochiltree. He adds that this settlement 'was little to the contentation' of the anti-reform party. We have another rather curious contemporary reference to the event in a letter from Thomas Archibald, chamberlain to the Archbishop of Glasgow, who was then in Paris. The chamberlain writes: 'John Willock is made Bishop of Glasgow now in your lordship's absence, and is placed in your place at Glasgow.' From the Register of Ministers, Exhorters, etc., we cull the following in reference to Willock's stipend: 'Superintendent of the West, having under him Lanark, Renfrow, Dunbertane, Kyle, Carrik, and Conygham—Quheit xxiiij bollis, Beir v chalderis, Aitis lx bollis, Meill iij chalderis, Money V<sup>c</sup> merkis.'<sup>1</sup> It may be noted, however, that Thomas Archibald, chamberlain to the Archbishop, also says in a letter, 'He (Willock) gets a thousand pounds yearly off the bishopric of Glasgow,

<sup>1</sup> As payments such as these are mentioned more than once in this book, we may state that in the year 1563 the boll of wheat in Scotland averaged £2; the boll of barley £1, 13s. 4d.; the boll of malt £2; and the boll of oats 10s. With regard to money payments, it should be remembered that the Scottish coinage was not nearly so debased in the sixteenth century as in later years. At the time of the Reformation, according to Cochran-Patrick's *Records of the Coinage of Scotland*, the comparative values of English and Scots money were about 1 to 5.

and dwells in the dean's house.' In the Preface to the *Diocesan Registers of Glasgow* (edited by Bain and Rogers), we are told that Father Innes, in an interesting letter (of 1st May 1738, when Innes was in his seventy-first year), asserts that the paucity of records—such as 'protocolla,' or abstracts of important deeds and transactions—within the diocese of Glasgow, and belonging to the University (some of which records were saved by Archbishop Beaton), was owing to the 'aversion of the leading men of the city to all our communion and character,' and more particularly to the Friar Willox with 'those of his gang' who possessed themselves of the buildings.

The only reference to Willock's engagement as Superintendent which we have found in contemporary documents is in the Burgh Records of Peebles, a town which really seems to have been outwith his 'diocese.'<sup>1</sup> But it fell to him to visit it, and if there were other places so depraved, the Superintendent's work must have been arduous and heart-breaking. Peebles, it appears, adhered to the old faith till the Lords of the Congregation were powerful enough, or had opportunity, to offer the town the new. At first Peebles refused, but on November 20, 1560, 'the bailies and community send a deputation to the Lords of the Congregation at Edinburgh to provide ane minister and preacher.' John Dickson was appointed, and it was 'Johne Willock, super-attendant in Glasgow,' who inducted him. But John Willock must have seen something like paganism prevailing at Peebles, for the new incumbent, designated 'exhortare and redare of the commoun prayers,' soon finds it necessary to address the following petition to the authorities :—

<sup>1</sup> Yet, before the Reformation, Peeblesshire was comprised in the Archbishopric of Glasgow.

‘Schirris baillies, counsale and communitie of the burgh of Peblis, humlie menis to your maisterschippis your servitor Johne Dikesone, exhortare in our said kirk of Peblis, desyring your maisterschippis now present cōvenit to appoynt elderis to wache our your said kirk quha has the feir of God afore ye, quhairthrow that vice may be pvnissit agreeable with the will of God as is revelit in his Evangell, and our reformat kirk ordourit as vtheris kirkkis is, that your maisterschippis obbeying the word of God may haif His blessing and also your knowlege oppynnit be the instructioun of his eternal Sprite, and in speciall that punishment may be put to their persones quha will nocht compleit the band of matrimony quilk in the presens of God is wickkitnes, and, sua that na correctioun be, your tovn sal be ane verray Sodome and Gomar, and all because na correctioun is put thairto be your maisterschippis, and sua gif ye omit this vndone God will pynis yow quha is hinderaris of the said purpos. And this present is to exoner me in the presens of God quha hes oft provit the samin by my writing, requiring your maisterschippis ansuer, always ye havand the feir of God afore ye, and for na partialite of ony persone, stay this quhilk ye know is agreeable with the will of the Eternale Juge quha hes set you in autorite.’

This same year, perhaps before entering on his new duties, Willock returns to England whence he brings back to Scotland his wife, an English lady. There is a curious reference to this in the appendix to Keith’s *History*, where we find a letter to Archbishop Beaton, of date 10th October 1560, and written from Glasgow, in which it is said, that ‘John Willock is going to London, with the ambassadors, to bring home his wife’; and when the ambassadors returned on the 3rd January 1561, we find, from the *Diurnal of*

*Occurrents*, that they 'brocht with them Johne Willok's wyff.'

Besides the controversy arranged for with the Abbot of Crossraguel, Willock had at least three other disputations with stalwarts of the old faith. The one seems to have occurred when he settled in Glasgow as Superintendent of the West, and was with John Black, a Dominican Friar; the other was with Ninian Winzet or Wingate, Master of Linlithgow Grammar School; while the third was with Robert Maxwell, Master of the Glasgow Grammar School. Bishop Leslie mentions these disputations, but gives us no details. This is what he says (in Dalrymple's *Scottish Translation of his History* from the Latin): 'Quhen Johne Black, a learned man, with disputatione continual the space of tua dayes, culd not bring Willox from defending his haeresie, nor culd turne him from his obstinacie, tha gyve over thair disputeng but (*i.e.* without) ony concord or kynd of griment. Quhairthrouch the ruid people, of sik a disputatione sa sharpe a varietie of baith handes, was wor than afore, and meikle mair doubted, than tha did: nouthar culd be talde quhome to tha suld consent, or gyve thair vote . . . as first with Knox, and schortlie efter with Spottiswode the Superintendens, Kinlouie the Minister, the blist sacrament's treuth [was discussed] in Lythcoi afor the hail court. Thairfor the self same disputed Mr N. Winzet, and with Willox for the same controversaries in Glasgwe [he and], Robert Maxual baith scuill maisteris.'

We know little or nothing about the last named; the second we have more than once referred to, and shall refer to again; but as to the first, Black, we may state that while Willock might be said to be Mary of Guise's last spiritual adviser (for she died very shortly after his solemn interview with her), Black was her

confessor when the fatal illness first came upon her. He seems to have been a man fairly well known in Scotland in Reformation times, and the following doggerel regarding him has come down to these latter days :—

‘ There was a certain Black-friar, always called Black,  
And this was no nickname, for black was his work,  
Of all the Black-friars he was the blackest clerk,  
Born in the Black Friars to be a black mark.’

The man was evidently unpopular, for one winter day the people stoned him in the streets.

It may be here stated that no works of Willock have come down to us, nor is it known with certainty if he was the author of any. Dempster—a Roman Catholic writer who calls Willock ‘ perfidus apostata,’ ‘ nefandus sectarius,’ ‘ impiissimi collega Knoxii,’ and hurls other opprobrious epithets at him—alludes to a book by him entitled *Impia quædam*, lib. i., but he adds ‘ sed non vidi,’ and no one else apparently has seen it. There are six letters, however, by the Reformer still extant which have reference to the preliminary arrangements for the abortive Crossraguel disputation, and they are very interesting as showing how an educated man of the sixteenth century spoke and wrote the old Scots tongue. They are to be found, along with their replies from Abbot Quintin Kennedy, in Wodrow’s *Miscellany*. According to Keith, the reason for the disputation not having taken place was that Willock came to it attended by four or five hundred Protestants instead of twelve as had been agreed upon. Kennedy, fearing a tumult, would not meet his opponent, and declined a private conference, entering a legal protest against Willock for departing from the agreement. The matter then dropped.

As introductory to a conversation between Knox



and Willock on the subject of ordination, we may refer now to an observation of Grub in his *Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*. Writing from the episcopal standpoint, this historian lays stress on the absence of ordination at St Andrews when John Knox was set apart for the ministry there, and incorrectly says that 'the circumstances connected with the proceedings show how entirely the doctrine of holy orders was rejected by the Scottish reformers'; but he is so far correct when he adds that 'no laying on of hands or other ceremony was used, and no allusion was made to the priestly ordination which Knox had already received, the solemn and deliberate choice of the people being held to be the only authority requisite for conferring the ministerial office.' Apart, however, from Knox having been ordained before, there is every likelihood that there would be some special prayer on this occasion, and certainly the preacher's charge to him was of a very solemn kind, indicating how weighty and sacred the ministerial function was. Still Knox was not the man to lay stress on mere external rite or ceremony, his reformation of religion being, indeed, a protest against undue attachment to such things. He has been censured, moreover, by some for admitting an uneducated, or rather a half-educated, man, William Harlaw, to the ministry, and for co-working with him. But any such censure should also be directed against the Church of England, for Harlaw had been ordained in that Church during the reign of Edward VI. Besides, he was a good man, earnest and brave, who had suffered and become an exile for his faith. He proved, too, an excellent parish minister. Let us give now some remarks on ordination, as supplied by Nicol Burne, a Roman Catholic controversialist contemporary with the speakers: 'In ane convention haldin be him (Knox),

Villox and otheris of their sect, as I undirstude of ane nobil and honorabil man quha can yit beir vitness gif I lea or not, Villox proposed as ane maist vechtie mater to considder, be quhat vay thai sould admit thair ministeris; for, said he, gif ve admit thame be the impositione of handis or onie uther ceremonie usit in ordinar calling, the lyk vil be askit of us, that we sheu that we war admittit to the ministrie with sik ane ceremonie be pastoris quha teached in the Kirk of Scotland befor us. Johane Knnox ansuerit maist resolutlie, Baf, baf, man, we ar anes entered. Let se quha sal put us out agane; meining that thair was not sa monie gunnis and pistollis in the countrey to put him out, as var to intend him with violence.' One would have liked the name of the nobleman who rehearsed this conversation to Nicol Burne, and, though Knox did lay stress on ordination he seems, on this occasion, to have acted on his own advice to Lethington—'melancholious reasons waed haif sum myrth intermixed.'

The above writer has another reference to Willock, and it is rather curious. When speaking of magical powers, he says, 'as for the practeis of magict, I might object unto you Villox, quhais sone raised the devil, your doctor, in Arthuris Seate, quhair ye maid your first preachingis,' the words being addressed to Knox.

The work as carried on by Willock must have been distasteful to Queen Mary, for we find that in 1565 she endeavoured to have him imprisoned in Dumbarton Castle; but he was held in great favour by the Protestants—now the greater portion of the nation—so much so that we find he has the unique distinction of having held the high office of Moderator of the General Assembly five times certainly, and seven probably, Knox himself only having held that high office twice. Indeed, we might say that Willock was the Moderator

of the first regular or fully constituted Général Assembly that ever met, namely, that which commenced its sittings on 25th December 1563, the previous Assemblies having been somewhat informal. It is curious that at one of the Assemblies, over which John Willock presided, there were members present who desired to censure him. The record is—‘Mr Willock being removed (*i.e.* desired to withdraw), it was complained that he did not use his endeavour for the extirpation of popery.’ On his return to the meeting he was told of what he had been accused, but ‘laid the blame of more effectual methods on the Duke of Chatelherault and the Earl of Cassillis ; and, further, he desired to be disburthened of the great charge laid upon him (that of Superintendent), which he had undertaken only for a time and requested the Assembly to lay no heavier burthen upon him than he was able to bear.’ It is sometimes said at the present day that meetings of the General Assembly are at times unruly and attended with disorder, but these appear to have been early faults of the Scottish Church, for once when Willock was approached to be Moderator again, we are informed by Archbishop Spottiswood that he was reluctant to accept ‘unless some better order were observed than had been in former times. For even then,’ the Archbishop (who, however, may have been biassed), says ‘the multitudes that convened, and the indiscreet behaviour of some who loved to appear more zealous than others, did cause great confusion. Obedience, however, being promised by the whole number, Mr Willock assumed the charge.’

Though, as already stated, the work as carried on by Willock was distasteful to Queen Mary, and she endeavoured to imprison him for it, yet she granted him an interview for conversation on matters in dispute

between them. This occurred at Perth on the 13th May 1565, and along with John Willock were his brother Superintendents, John Winram and John Spottiswood. Knox tells us about it, and says that the Queen 'cherished them with fair words,' and 'although not persuaded in any religion but in that wherein she was brought up,' she was willing to hear what they had to say for their faith. Moreover, she undertook to arrange for a public conference on the ecclesiastical state of the nation, but untoward circumstances prevented its being held.

In 1567 Willock was in England, and the General Assembly sent him a most pressing and touching letter to return. We give it to our readers that they may see the high regard in which he was held by the Church. Moreover, it is an important document of the times :—

*'VIDEBAM SATANAM SICUT FULGUR DE COELO  
CADENTEM.*

'As the Lord our God hath at all times beene, frome the beginning of this his worke of reformatioun, and restitution of the puritie of his true worship and religioun within Scotland, loving brother in the Lord, most beneficiall and bountifull toward this realme, so hath he now, by this last most miraculous victorie and overthrow, poured forth in greatest abundance the richies of his mercie, in that not onlie he hath driven away the tempest and storme, but also hath quieted and calmed all surges of persecutioun, as now, we may thinke weill our shippe is receaved, and placed in a most happie and blessed port. Our enemies, praised be God, are dashed; religioun established; sufficient provision made for ministers; order takin, and penaltie appointed for all sort of transgressioun and transgressors; and above all, a godlie magistrat,

whom God, of his eternall and heavenlie providence, hath reserved to this age, to putt in executioun whatsoever He by his law commandeth. Now, then, loving brother, as your presence was to us all in time of trouble most comfortable, so it is now of us all universallie wished; but most earnestlie craved by your owne flocke, who continuallie, at all Assemblies, have declared the force of that conjunction, the earnestness of that love, the pith of that zeale and mutuall care, that bindeth the pastor with his flocke which nather by processe of time is diminished, nor by separatioun and distance of places restringed, nor yitt by anie tyrannie and feare dissolved. True it is that, at this most earnest and just petition, we have ever still winked this while past; nor but that to us all your absence was most dolorous. But, in respect of troubles, we judged more meete to await for suche opportunitie as now God, in this most wonderfull victorie of his' Evangell, hath offered. Therefore, seeing all impediments are removed, and your flocke still continueth in earnest sute for you, and now everie where throughout the realme commissioners and superintendents placed, and one offered to them, and by them refused altogether, awaiting for you, we could no longer stay, but agree to this their desire. In sute whereof, nather through feare have they fainted, nor by charges retarded, nor yitt by any kinde of offer desisted. And, as we have beene moved to grant to them that which they have thus humblie and continuallie suted, we cannot but persuade our selves but yee will satisfie the same. Nather can we thinke that the sheeheard will refuse his flock, that the father will reject the just petition of his sonne, least of all, that the faithfull servant of God will shutt up his ears at the voice and commandment of the Kirke, or yitt denie his labours to his owne countrie. The time is



proper now, to reape with blytheness that which by you before was sowin in teares, and injoy the fruit of your most wearisome and painfull labours. It sall be no lesse pleasant to you, to see your owne native countrie at libertie and freedome, which yee left in mourning and sobbing, under the heavie burthein of most cruell servitude, than comfortable to behold the religioun of Jesus Christ throughout all the realme flourishing, virtue encreassing, virtuous men in reputatioun ; and, finallie, to embrace these dayes which, howsoever by your own self have beene most piouslie desired, yitt could yee never looke to obteane the same. Now, at last, to conclude : unless yee will be an enemie to your countrie, yee will not refuse these requeists. Unless you will be stubborne and disobedient, yee will not contemne the commandment of the kirk. Unless yee will be carelesse and unthankfull, yee will not despise the humble, continuall, and earnest sute of your flocke. And, last of all, we assure our selves, that ye are not so astricted and addicted to your owne particular, as that this generall and common caus should be in anie wise by you neglected. Now sall yee see the kaip-stone of that worke whereof ye layed the foundation. Thus we cannot looke for anie other answeare than yee sall give by your self, and that with all expedition possible. Our state, yee know, is not so sure, but we ever stand upon our watches. But that, we know, will not stay you, seeing your compt is so layed. Thus we committ you to the protectioun of our Lord Jesus. At Edinburgh in our Generall Assemblie, and seventh sessioun thereof.' Willock complied with this request, and returned for a period to Scotland.

Willock assisted in drawing up the Confession of Faith, or 'Confessio Scotica,' which was ratified by Parliament on 17th August 1560. He seems, also,

to have played an important part in certain private negotiations with the nobles and prelates before the Confession was formally submitted to the whole Parliament, for in a letter written by Cecil in that year we read: 'Mr Knox and Mr Willock were yesterday before the lords of the articles with the bishops [and the archbishop of] St Andrews desired to have a copy of the confession of their faith.' In the same year he was one of the ministers—one of the six Johns who had also drawn up the Confession of Faith—to whom was assigned the task of drawing up the *First Book of Discipline*, which defined the authority and jurisdiction of the Church as then constituted. Though many of the reforming nobility and gentlemen approved of the book, and appended their names to it, there were others who, having already appropriated or marked out for future appropriation large portions of Church lands and revenue, could not brook the proposal to allocate this wealth towards the preaching of the Gospel, the education of the people, and the amelioration of the lot of the poor, or, as they would say, to distribute the wealth among the ministers, the schoolmasters, and the poor. Moreover, some of these nobles and gentlemen were rather free in their living, and dreaded the restrictions of the *Book of Discipline*. Consequently, though this book was finally approved by the General Assembly of the year 1581, and was placed among the Acts of the Kirk, it never was formally approved by Parliament.

Willock played a small, though important, part in connection with the Casket Letters, or, to be more correct, with the Commission which met to enquire into the dethroned Queen Mary's conduct. The conference with the Scottish Commissioners having been removed from York to London by Queen Elizabeth's

orders, assumed a more august shape, as some of England's greatest nobles were summoned for the special duty. There appears to have been some particular agreement come to, or scheme arranged, between the Regent of Scotland (Moray) and the Duke of Norfolk, who were both present; and several people were very anxious to know what that agreement, or scheme, was. Queen Elizabeth herself was one of them. Who could supply the information? There was one man, apart from the principals, who could, and that was John Willock. How he came to know the secret we cannot tell, and it is impossible to believe that he would have betrayed the Earl of Moray. But somehow the Earl of Morton knew that Willock had the information, and he was determined that Queen Elizabeth should have it. So, possibly unaware that it was wanted for so mighty a personage, Willock, at Morton's suggestion, imparted the information to his friend and patron, the Earl of Huntingdon, who passed it on to the Earl of Leicester, and he, again, told it to Elizabeth. A narrative of all this—and a curious story it is—we have in Sir James Melville's *Memoirs*

At the time of the Regent Moray's assassination John Willock was in England, but he wrote to Knox a letter in detestation of the crime. Bannatyne has it, 'word be word' as he says in his *Memoriales*, as follows:—

'It grieved me so to write, that I cannot write ony-thing twiching the crueltie of these bloudie beasts (the Hammiltounes he means), that devised and practised that abominable and bloudie fact! The Lord revenge it! And I put no doubt but that filthie fact hes so filled thair coupe of the judgmentis of the eternalle God, that thair restis nothing for thame but drinking up the same to thair everlasting schame and confusione; for the whole Church of God called and cryed, bezides

the voce of the bloud itself, "*Vindica Domine Deus sanguinem innocentis.*" And lyk as by the just judgment of God, the Benjamites wer in ane maner routed out, so hath this cruell fact craved (not only in my judgment but in the judgment of all upright myndit heir) the lyke judgment. God work in thame trew repentance, gif it be possible, when the servantis of God do agrie in threatning of the wicked ! The wicked, be thai never so proude, thai have cause to feir.'

Knox was anxious to have his old friend with him at that time of national grief, but the latter was prevented from coming to Scotland ; nor does he appear to have visited again his native land. As he died in 1585, one wonders why he remained so long absent. We have seen that his wife belonged to England, and it is to be remembered Willock was still rector of Loughborough. Perhaps he may have thought that the Reformation Church was now firmly established in Scotland, and that his services could be dispensed with. It may be, too, that he was tired of strife. At any rate he seems to have spent the last fifteen years of his life in the quiet seclusion of Loughborough. He had one friend at least in the English episcopate, namely, Dr Barlow, Bishop of Chichester, for Willock and he had laboured together in the Protestant cause at Emden, the latter having likewise fled to that place from the Marian persecution. And if in the diocese of Peterborough there was the same liberty as in that of Chichester—for Dr Barlow was not rigorous in exacting from his clergy unlimited conformity to 'the habits and ceremonies' of the Church—Willock may have found his situation very agreeable. He died at the rectory of Loughbourogh on the 4th December 1585, as is attested by an entry in the parish register. His wife, Catherine, survived him fourteen years, and was laid to rest beside

him on the 10th October 1599. We have had considerable correspondence with persons in Loughborough as to any information obtainable regarding Willock's life and work in that town, but have been unable to gain any facts. One of the correspondents, however, who is a member of the Church of England, writes that 'Loughborough since the time of Willock has always been noted as a centre of nonconformity and freedom in religious thought and worship. It is only fair to surmise that this should have been to a great extent resultant upon the preaching, work, and example of Willock, who was undoubtedly a man of great forcefulness and eloquence. Perhaps, after all, this is the best tribute to his memory. Henry, the third Earl of Huntingdon, who presented the living to Willock, had a house here at that time, and, being a very zealous reformer, would give powerful assistance to Willock in his work.' It may be stated that Loughborough, situated about eleven miles to the north-west of Leicester, is to-day a town of some twenty thousand inhabitants. Its parish church, of decorated style and with perpendicular tower, dates from the fourteenth century. The grammar school also is of date prior to Willock's time. Hosiery is the staple trade, but Loughborough has a reputation for bell founding as well, the great bell of St Paul's having been cast there. John Howe was a native of the town, and Lord Chancellor Wedderburn took his title from it.

A monstrous calumny has been attached to our reformer in his old age. He is said to have committed a robbery, for which he was imprisoned in Leicester jail. Apart from such a crime being inconceivable in the case of such a good man, and a man now of ripe years—at an age when robbers (when the gallows spare them) generally think of retiring from their



profession'—the calumny is sufficiently disproved by the fact that the date of the charge is 1590, while Willock died in 1585. It is George Chalmers, in his *Life of Ruddiman*, who makes the accusation, and bases it on the following extract from the Records of the State Paper Office, of date 22nd April 1590:—'Twa men, the ane namyt Johnne Gibsone, Scottishman, preacher, and the other Johnne Willokis, now baith lying in prison at Leicester, were convicted by a jury of robbery.' It is to be noted that the second convict was not a preacher, else the designation would have been added to his name as it is to that of the first; nor does the second appear to have been a Scotsman, or surely it would have been stated, as is done in the case of the first. But the good rector of Loughborough may have had a bad son—grace is not hereditary—and it may be that young scapegrace who is the criminal. Such, however, is mere supposition, as we know nothing about this reformer's family.<sup>1</sup>

John Willock's is a name which should not be allowed to die. As we have seen, he played a most important part in Scotland's Reformation struggle. Contemporaries appraised his work and his character very highly. We have already quoted some of John Knox's words regarding him. Let us repeat them. He calls him 'a dear brother,' 'a man godly, learned, grave,' 'of bold courage,' 'deserving of immortal praise,' and he considers him a gift bestowed by God on Scotland. We trust that this biography will help to perpetuate the name and good deeds of this Scots worthy, not only among Scottish people but among all who hold brave and noble lives in respect and reverence.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This must be qualified. See Note 2.

<sup>2</sup> See Note 3.

## APPENDIX

## NOTE I

## WAS WILLOCK A FRANCISCAN OR DOMINICAN ?

Some writers—Dr Graves Law among their number—tell us that Willock was a Dominican. Even in Bishop Leslie's History we have, 'Jhone Willox, quha laitie had defected from the dominican ordour.' On the other hand, Archbishop Spottiswood, whose father must have known Willock well, says he was a Franciscan, and so too affirms Bishop Keith ; every reference to him in Ayrshire documents seems to indicate that he was of the order of St Francis ; and we have this testimony of John Gibson, a careful author who, in his *History of Glasgow* (Glasgow, 1777), says : 'John Willocks, one of the most popular of the preachers, was appointed Superintendent of the West, by the commissioners of burrows, with some of the nobility and barons, who were met at Edinburgh. This man had been a Franciscan friar in the town of Air, and having embraced the doctrines of the reformation, had fled into England to save himself from the persecution carrying on, at that time, in Scotland.'

The matter, we fear, must be left in doubt. Possibly those who claim him as a Dominican have mixed up friars who preached—all the mendicant orders, whether black, grey, or white preached—with the official designation of the Dominicans, 'Ordo Fratrum Prædicatorum.'

We have used the word 'monastery' with reference to the religious institution in Ayr, of which Willock was an inmate. 'Convent,' would be more correct, but that term has become more associated nowadays in Scotland with nunneries, and even learned historians often apply the word 'monastery' to the houses of the friars. In strict accuracy, however, a monastery is the home of the monks (*monachi*), while a convent is the abode of friars (*fratres*).

## NOTE 2

## WILLOCK AT LOUGHBOROUGH, HIS FAMILY, ETC.

To Canon Pitts, the present rector of Loughborough, and Charles Harris, Esq., sacristan and vestry clerk there, I am indebted for the following communication :—

‘John Willock was presented to the Rectory of Loughborough by Henry, Earl of Huntingdon. He died on Decr. 4th, 1585. The following is entered in the Register of Loughborough: “Master John Willocks, preacher and parson of this Parish of Loughborough, departed this Lyfe on the iiij daye of December and was buried on the vth daye of the same, being Sondaye in the Year of God 1585.”

‘In the year 1570 he was overseer, and was witness to the will of Thomas Harley, a member of an ancient Loughborough family. Descendants of this family are still living in Loughborough.

‘Ed. Willocke (probably his son) was godfather at the baptism of George, son of Mr John Dawsons, Simon Modd was the other godfather, and Lady Dorothea Hastings, afterwards Countess of Huntington, was godmother.

‘The Rector’s will, dated 12th August 1584, was proved on December 11th, 1585, by his widow, Katherine Willocke. In it he mentioned his brothers Bartholomew and William; his son, Edmund Willocke, and Gysell his wife, and their children, John, Katherine, Mary, Bridget, Dorothy, and George. He also directed that no ringing of bells was to take place after his death, nor any pomp. He left twenty shillings to the poor of Loughborough—a considerable sum in those days.

‘The John Dawsons previously mentioned was master of the Grammar School for forty-eight years, and probably was rector or acting as minister before John Willock was presented to the rectory.

‘There does not appear to be any mention of the surname of the wife of John Willock. It was probably Pickavnell. The following appears in the Register—“Katherine Willocke late wife of Mr Willocke, Parson of Loughborough, buried ye 10th day of October 1599.”

‘Her will, dated 22nd October 1597, was proved on 6th November 1599, at Leicester, by her niece Mary, wife of Thomas Clarke the younger of Loughborough. She also mentioned her brother, Stephen Pickavnell, and her nieces, Bridgett Knifeton, widow, and Dorothy Willocke.

‘There does not appear any further information obtainable as to the after history of the family, or anything more as to the life and character of John Willock when rector here.

‘Loughborough was at one time in the Diocese of Lincoln, but at the time of Willock and since it has been part of the

Diocese of Peterborough. Edmund Scambler, chaplain to Archbishop Parker, was consecrated Bishop of Peterborough on February 16th, 1561, and was translated to Norwich in 1585. He was succeeded by Richard Howland, Master of Magdalene and St John's, Cambridge, and Rector of Strathern. He was consecrated on February 7th, 1585.

'Dr Barlow was nominated to the see of Chichester in 1559. I do not think he was at any time Bishop of Lincoln. Nicholas Bullingham was appointed to Lincoln in the following year.

'Mary Willocke, daughter of Mr Edmund Willocke, baptized the 22nd April 1577.

'George Willocke, son of Edmund Willocke, baptized 13th April 1579.'

## NOTE 3

## LINES ON WILLOCK

John Johnston (1570?-1612), Professor of Theology at St Andrews, wrote a series of Latin poems on the Scottish Martyrs and Reformers. The full title of his work is: ΠΕΡΙΣΤΕΠΑΝΩΝ ΣΙΣΤΕ DE CORONIS MARTYRUM IN SCOTIA; NECNON PECULIUM ECCLESIAE SCOTICANÆ, and the volume in manuscript is to be found in the Advocates' Library, Edinburgh. He has a poem on Willock, which we now give, with metrical translation.

## JOHANNES WILLOCVS

## OBIIT IN ANGLIA

Cum Patriæ implessem donis cælestibus urbes,  
 Mille olim obiiciens mortibus hanc animam,  
 Ipsa adeo exultat cæli sic luce sereni,  
 Pene sibi ut cælum, et lux queat esse aliis :  
 Excessi patria lætus tellure, libensque :  
 Vt vicina istis cresceret aucta opibus.  
 Hic etiam sevi cælestia semina verbi ;  
 Gensque pia hic nostram plurima sensit opem.  
 Hæc et opes mihi, cumque opibus cumulavit honores ;  
 Nec secus ac Patria me Anglia civem habuit.  
 Bis civis gemina in patria : mihi tertia restat ;  
 Possidet hæredem tertia sola suum.

## JOHN WILLOCK

DIED IN ENGLAND

To Scotland's cities first, though forced to brave  
 A thousand deaths, the Gospel's boon I gave,  
 Then, when my native land became so bright,  
 With wide dispersion of the sacred light,  
 That, now itself a heaven, it could essay  
 To show to other lands the heavenward way,  
 With glad, light heart I southwards turned my helm,  
 To enrich with gospel truth the neighbour realm.  
 I sowed the seed divine on English soil,  
 And many a soul upraised repaid my toil.  
 Giving me wealth and rank with plenteous hand,  
 England became my second fatherland.  
 The third and best awaits me, Christ's fair home.  
*Its citizens no more desire to roam.*

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Knox's *History*.  
 Calderwood's *History*.  
 Row's *History*.  
 Spottiswood's *History*.  
 Bishop Leslie's *Historie of Scotland*. The Scottish Text Society.  
 Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*.  
 Pagan's *Annals of Ayr*, 1560-1692.  
*Ayrshire and Galloway Archæological Association's Publications*  
 —*The Friars of Ayr*.  
*Diocesan Registers of Glasgow* (edited by Bain and Rogers).  
*Satirical Poems of the Reformation*. The Scottish Text Society.  
*Zurich Letters*. Parker Society.  
 Sir James Melville's *Memoirs of his own Life*.  
 Wodrow's *Miscellany*.  
 Wodrow's *Collections*.  
 M'Crie's *Life of John Knox*.  
 Lorimer's *John Knox and the Church of England*.  
*Dictionary of National Biography*. Article, 'John Willock.'  
 Rankin's *Handbook of the Church of Scotland*.  
 Fletcher's *Parish Registers of Loughborough*.  
 Nicol's *History and Antiquities of Leicestershire*.  
 Strypes' *Annals*.  
 Strypes' *Memorials*.  
 Fischer's *Scots in Germany*.



## CHAPTER IV

### JOHN WINRAM

THERE are numerous references to John Winram in Knox's *History of the Reformation of Religion within the Realm of Scotland*. Let us cull the following. After the martyrdom of Patrick Hamilton, Knox says: 'Within St Andrews, yea, almost within the whole realm (who heard of that fact) there was none found who began not to enquire, Wherefore was Master Patrick Hamilton burned? And when his Articles were rehearsed, question was holden, if such Articles were necessary to be believed under the pain of damnation. And so within short space many began to call in doubt that which before they held for a certain verity, in so much that the University of St Andrews, and St Leonard's College principally, by the labours of Master Gawin Logie,<sup>1</sup> and the novices of the Abbey, by the Sub-prior [Winram], began to smell somewhat of the verity, and to espy the vanity of the received superstition. Yea, within a few years after, began both Black and Grey Friars publicly to preach against the pride and idle life of Bishops, and against the abuses of the whole ecclesiastical estate.'

Some years earlier, in 1546—when George Wishart

<sup>1</sup> 'Mr Gawin Logie instilled into his schollars the truthe secreitlie, which they, in processe of time, spread through the whole countrie, whereupon did arise a proverbe. When anie man savoured of true religioun, it was said to him, "Yee have drunken of Sanct Leonard's Well." '—Calderwood's *History*, i. 83.

was about to be led to the stake—Knox writes in this way: ‘Upon the next morn my Lord Cardinal caused his servants to dress themselves in their warlike array, with jack, knapsack, splent, spear, and axe, more seeming for the war than for preaching the true Word of God. And when these armed champions, marching in warlike order, had conveyed the Bishops into the Abbey Church, incontinently they sent for Master George, who was conveyed into the said Church by the Captain of the Castle, and the number of one hundred men, dressed in manner foresaid, like a lamb led they him to sacrifice. . . . And when he came before the Cardinal, by and by the Sub-prior of the Abbey, called Dean John Winram, stood up in the pulpit, and made a sermon to all the congregation there and then assembled.’ The sermon over and the trial finished, when Wishart was about to be led to his doom, ‘they sent for the Sub-Prior of the Abbey, who came to him [for his confession] with all diligence.’ Fourteen years after this, when Winram had become a Protestant, we read: ‘Hereafter were the Commissioners, with some of the nobility and Barons, appointed to see the equal distribution of ministers. John Knox was appointed to Edinburgh, Christopher Goodman to St Andrews, Adam Heriot to Aberdeen, Master John Row to St Johnston, Paul Methven to Jedburgh, William Christison to Dundee, David Ferguson to Dunfermline, and Master David Lindsay to Leith. There were nominated for Superintendents—Master John Spottiswood for Lothian, Master John Winram for Fife, Master John Willock for Glasgow, the Laird of Dun for Angus and Mearns, Master John Carswell for Argyle and the Isles.’ This was in July 1560. On the 17th August of the same year the Confession of Faith was ratified by Parliament, and then, later in this year, with reference to the *Book*

*of Discipline*, Knox says: 'The Parliament dissolved, consultation was held, how the Kirk might be established in a good and godly policy, which by the Papists was altogether defaced. Commission and charge was given to Master John Winram Sub-Prior of St Andrews, Master John Spottiswood, Master John Willock, Master John Douglas, Rector of St Andrews, Master John Row, and John Knox, to draw up in a volume the Policy and Discipline of the Kirk, as well as they had done the Doctrine [in the Confession of Faith]. This they did and presented to the Nobility, who did peruse it many days.' The History tells that there were other occasions when Winram came into prominence—notably when he was selected to enter the lists in a great doctrinal tournament with Knox—but to these we shall refer later; and towards the close of this chapter we shall quote again from this vivid record of those stirring times, showing what was Knox's estimate of his fellow-reformer.

Who, then, was this man who evidently occupied an important place in the Scottish Church immediately before and after the Reformation? John Winram, Wynram, or Winraham<sup>1</sup> (Latin, Vinramus), was descended from a Midlothian family—the Winrams of Ratho—and in all likelihood it was in that county he was born in the year 1492. He is sometimes referred to as of the 'Winrams of Kirkness,' on the shores of Lochleven, but there were no Winrams of Kirkness. The property belonged to the Priory of Portmoak, and John Winram being for some time Prior there, he was occasionally styled 'of Kirkness.' Whether it was he who brought other Winrams from Midlothian to the shires of Fife and Kinross it is impossible to say, but from the Register of the Kirk-Session of St Andrews

<sup>1</sup> James Melville, in his *Diary*, calls him 'Woundram.'

(1559-1600) it appears that several kinsmén, or at least persons bearing the same name, were contemporary with him in those parts of the kingdom. The surname is unusual, and has almost died out in Scotland. In the Edinburgh Directory the name occurs three times; in that of Glasgow it does not occur at all; and in the county Directories we have sought in vain for it. Only one other of the name attained to any eminence, and that was George Winram, also of Midlothian, a Scottish Judge of the seventeenth century with the title of Lord Liberton, who was one of the Scottish Commissioners to the Westminster Assembly.<sup>1</sup>

John Winram was entered as a student at the University of St Andrews—St Leonard's College—in the year 1513. He is classed as of the 'natio Loudoniæ.' In 1515 his name occurs among the Determinants (*i.e.* Bachelors of Arts), and he is designated as a pauper, which means one who paid the lowest rates of fees. In looking over the list of students, however, of the preceding year, his own year, and the year following, we notice that all of them came under the heading 'pauperes.' It is only a few in after years who have 'dives' after their names. Contemporary with Winram, and of the same year, were John Douglas, afterwards Archbishop of St Andrews, and Alexander Alan or Alane, better known as Alesius. One or two years before Winram entered St Leonard's College, there had been enrolled there—and perhaps at times the freshman would see them in St Andrews—two young men whose names afterwards became well known in the country, and who played very different parts when the Reformation was commencing in Scotland, and these were David Beaton, who became Cardinal Beaton, and David Lyndsay, who became Sir David Lyndsay

<sup>1</sup> See Note 1.

of the Mount, Lord Lyon King at Arms. Over all there presided—though, alas ! he fell at Flodden in the year that Winram's curriculum commenced—the youthful Alexander Stewart, a pupil of Erasmus, who had been invested with the Archbishopric and Chancellorship, was a great benefactor to the Colleges of St Andrews, and on whose noble character Dean Stanley has written with feeling and beauty.

As early at least as 1528, Winram was an inmate of the Augustinian Monastery of St Andrews. In 1532 there is a notice of him under the title of 'canonicus ac baccalarius in Theologia,' and as one of the Rector's assessors. Later, as an assessor, he is designated 'magister,' which points to his having taken the degree of M.A. In a deed dated the same year, he appears as a Canon Regular of the Monastery. Two years afterwards he is mentioned as third Prior, and in 1536 as Sub-Prior, in which station he continued till the Reformation. The Lord James Stewart—afterwards Earl of Moray and Regent of the Kingdom—was Prior of St Andrews *in commendam*, which would prevent Winram holding that office. It may be stated that the Priory of St Andrews held the foremost place in rank and wealth of the Religious Houses of Scotland. Belonging to the Canons Regular of St Augustine, it was founded, or at least endowed with property of value, by Robert, Bishop of St Andrews, in 1144, and, two or three years later, was confirmed in its function of electoral chapter of the Bishopric by Pope Eusebius III. It had great prestige, its possessions extending beyond that of the See—which was a very extensive one—even to the wild districts of Mar and the Grampians ; and its Prior, with the ring and mitre and other symbols of episcopacy, took precedence in Parliament of Abbots and all other dignitaries of the regular orders. There



were in the city, besides, monasteries of both the Black and Grey Friars.

Winram became a Doctor of Theology in 1539(-40), as we learn from the *Rentale Sancti Andree*, and that same volume informs us that Cardinal Beaton on the occasion presented him with £20. There appears to have been considerable outlay connected with 'ascending the doctor's chair in Theology' at St Andrews, for, apart from fees and entertainment expenses, the Doctor of Theology was required to provide 'bonnets' (birettas) for the graduates of the Faculty, and gloves for the distinguished men who came to hear the inaugural address. So the Cardinal's gift would doubtless be very welcome to Winram. Sometimes we find the latter styled Dean Winram. In the University records we find him designated 'sacrarum literarum professor eximius.' Winram also held the vicarage of Dow (Dull).

That he was a learned man is evident, not only from his having attained to these degrees and offices, but from the testimony of Quintin Kennedy, Abbot of Crossraguel, who says that he was 'wonderfully learned both in the New Testament and Old Testament and meikle mair.' But the Abbot adds that he was a 'pestilent precheour,' and one of the 'devil's rachis' (scenting dogs as distinguished from greyhounds). This Abbot Kennedy, however, includes Knox, Willock, Douglas, Heriot, Spottiswood and indeed all the preachers of Reform in the same category; but as controversialists then did not fight with gloves, or use rose-water, such epithets are scarcely to be taken at their face value. In an old Latin document of the Friars of Ayr 'Joannes Knoxus' is called 'Diaboli filius,' 'necromantius,' and 'Presbyter apostata.' Nicol Burne, a Romish opponent, suggested that he

should be called *Nox* instead of Knox, *a nocendo*, as he had been very 'noysum' to 'Christis Kirk quha was his mother,' and he might be 'callit ἀπολλύων, *perdens*.' Knox, moreover, was charged with adultery, incest, withcraft, and of having been seen in company with the devil! Controversy in those days was not complete without accusing adversaries of grave moral lapses and terrible crimes. But Knox himself did not mince his words when speaking of his enemies. The language of his History is indeed amazingly, and often amusingly, pointed and picturesque.

We may gather from our first quotation from the History that Winram's mind was receptive and enquiring. He was not satisfied with the sentence passed on Patrick Hamilton, and he was inclined to believe that the martyr had truth on his side. The fact that he was appointed to preach the sermon in connection with the opening proceedings of Wishart's trial shows that he was a man of some standing and ability. He took as his text the Parable of the Wheat and the Tares, and, while maintaining that the Word of God, without any superadded tradition, was the only and undoubted foundation for a trial of heresy, he argued that heretics should be summarily dealt with, a proposition difficult to reconcile with his text which commands that the wheat and the tares grow together till harvest.<sup>1</sup> Wishart was drawn to this man. Perhaps he perceived in him something different from the other monks and priests around, and there may have been in that sermon a higher note which appealed to the martyr's heart. Lindsay of Pitscottie, in his *Chronicle*, says that the sermon was done 'maist honourabillie and clarklie,' and that the preacher beseeched 'the bishops and kirkmen to leif rancour and malice out of thair hearts' towards the

<sup>1</sup> See Note 2.

accused and 'to follow Christ in love and charitie . . . as Christ did gif direction to his appostollis in lyke maner.' We have seen it stated (but we do not know on what authority) that Cardinal Beaton upbraided the Sub-Prior for pleading on Wishart's behalf, and used the following words: 'Well, sir, and you, we know what a man you are, aye seven years ago.' The utterance is rather cryptic, and may mean either that Winram should not thus have acted as for long he had been considered a stalwart of the old faith, or—and this is more likely—that he was only doing what was expected of one who, for some years back, was under the Cardinal's suspicion of leanings towards the cause of reform.

The sermon certainly displayed unusual toleration. In any case, Wishart would have nothing to do with the two friars who were sent to confess him, but asked that Winram be sent for that solemn purpose. Knox tells us that he does not know what Wishart confessed, but Pitscottie affirms that Wishart declared his innocence and asked the consent of Cardinal Beaton that he should 'have the Communion,' which was angrily refused.

Another proof of Winram's learning, or at least of the regard in which he was held as a debater, is supplied by the Convention of Black and Grey Friars summoned to discuss certain articles of the reformed faith. As Sub-Prior—and since Beaton's death Vicar-General of the diocese—he had been ordered by John Hamilton, who was elected, but not yet consecrated, Archbishop, to call this Convention as a matter of urgency after Knox's great sermon at St Andrews in the year 1547, to hear which there were present, as representing the University, Sub-Prior John Winram, Dean of the Faculty of Theology, John Major, some canons, and a number of friars of the two orders. Winram spoke for

the old faith, but was easily discomfited by Knox and, retiring from the field, left Friar Arbuckle to continue the debate.<sup>1</sup> It may be mentioned that about this time a regular course of sermons was arranged for to be delivered in the parish church of St Andrews on successive Sundays. It was evidently an idea of Winram's, and the preachers were to be the most learned men connected with the Religion Houses and the University. The discourses were not to be controversial, or such as would give offence to persons of tender conscience. So careful indeed were the preachers to be—weighing their words well—that they all agreed 'to pen their sermons.' Winram began the course, and the others followed according to rank or seniority. Knox was thus prevented from occupying the parish church pulpit on the Sundays; but he occupied it on several of the week-days, and he regularly attended and listened carefully to the Sunday preachers. He was pleased to hear them preach the pure Gospel, though they were still in the Romish Church, and told his hearers at the week-day services that he praised the Lord for such preaching. So Winram in this way was sowing the good seed, and helping on the Reformation. The *Rentale Sancti Andree* carries us back to the year 1542, when, from that venerable document, we find Winram sitting as judge in a trial for witchcraft, the circumstances being as follows. Three women were deemed to be witches, and, by order of the vicars-general, they were brought from Edinburgh and Dunfermline and lodged as prisoners in the Castle of St Andrews. Cardinal Beaton was absent at the time in France, but he appointed as judges in the case, John Major, Provost of St Salvator's, Peter Chaplain, and Martin Balfour, Canons of the

<sup>1</sup> See Note 3.

College, and John Winram. The old 'Rental Book gives no details of the charges, the witnesses, or the evidence, but informs us that the death sentence was pronounced, and duly carried out on the poor creatures.

There was a Convention or Council held at Edinburgh in 1549, at which Winram was present. In the register of it he is styled 'ecclesiæ metrop. primitialis S. Andreæ canonicus regularis, sub-prior, theologiæ doctor,' and at that Council he was employed to draw up the canon intended to settle a strange dispute which had been greatly agitating the clergy, as to whether the *Pater Noster* should be said to the saints, or to God alone. It appears that this controversy had originated at St Andrews, and the following anecdote, in connection with it, is told by Archbishop Spottiswood of Winram and his servant. When the question was being debated, Winram's servant, whose name was Thomas, and who was considered a simple kind of creature, seeing that there was some important matter on hand which made the great doctors so often convene, asked his master one night as he went to bed what the business might be. Doctor Winram merrily answered, 'Tom, we cannot agree to whom the *Pater Noster* should be said.' 'To whom,' replied Thomas, 'should it be said, but unto God.' 'But what, then,' asked the Doctor, 'shall we do with the saints?' Thomas's answer came very much in these words: 'Give them, in the name of the great enemy, *aves* and *credos* enow' (namely, Hail Mary! Hail St Peter! Hail St Andrew! etc.,) 'for that may suffice them, but let God have His glory.' Dr Winram was pleased with his servant's sagacity; reported his words to the Council; and their decision was that 'Mr Winram should return to St Andrews, and settle the minds of the people there, by telling them that the Lord's Prayer ought to be addressed to



God ; yet so as that the saints also ought to be invoked.' This was certainly ambiguous, and it was observed afterwards by many, 'that a simple man had given a wiser decision than the doctors had done, with all their learned distinctions.' While our earlier ecclesiastical historians and biographers—such as Foxe, Calderwood, Spottiswood, Keith, and, we may add, in later days, M'Crie—relate that such a controversy took place in the Scottish Church, Grub, in his History, doubts it, and holds that the Provincial Council had no matter of this kind before them. There seems, however, to be some confusion in Grub's mind as to the exact date or session of the Council at which Winram's Canon is understood to have settled the matter. It is of some significance that Henry Balnaves says there were those who did address the *Pater Noster* to saints, and Sir David Lyndsay asserts the same (see Laing's *John Knox*, iii. 518, 519, and Laing's *Lyndsay*, iii. 27-28). But, whether the matter came before the Provincial Council or not, it is quite certain that it was disputed at St Andrews, and caused there no little 'bruite and tumult,' which Winram played no small part in allaying.

In 1550 a great trial for heresy took place at Edinburgh, in the Church of the Black Friars. The Archbishop of St Andrews, the Dean of Glasgow (as representing Glasgow's Archbishop), several Bishops and other church dignitaries, were present, with many other churchmen and doctors, as well as the Earl of Argyll, justiciar, his deputy, and several lay lords. According to a note (p. 134) in Patrick's *Statuta*, John Winram was there. The 'heretic' was Adam Wallace. He was condemned, and on the day after the trial was burnt at the stake on the Castlehill of Edinburgh. The constitution of this tribunal or assembly, before

which Wallace appeared, seems to have been of a special nature, composed as it was of churchmen, supported by the criminal authorities, and certain lay lords; and it may have taken the place of the statutory meeting of the Provincial Council which should have met about that time.

We cannot say whether Winram was present at the Provincial Council held at Edinburgh in 1552, which approved of Archbishop Hamilton's Catechism, but it is held by some that he was the author of that work. The object of the publication was to vindicate and popularise the Romish faith and worship, and the Council describes it as '*librum quendam vulgari et Scotico idiomate conscriptum*'—a certain book written in the vulgar and Scottish dialect. Its title is—'The Catechism, that is to say ane cōmone and catholic instructioun of the Christen people in matteris of religioun, quhilk na guid Christin man or woman suld misknaw.' Dr Thomas M'Crie says that the Catechism is written in a good style, and he is inclined to the belief that Winram wrote it. It is almost the only book in which is to be found the doctrinal and devotional language of Catholic Scotland, and as a literary production it is most valuable for the student of early Scots literature. The Council committed it to Hamilton, as Primate, to have it printed, and this was done at his own expense. His name, moreover, appears on the title-page and colophon; but M'Crie holds that Archbishop Hamilton could never have taken the trouble to compose such a book, consisting as it did of 411 pages quarto, even though he had been in other respects qualified for the task. Lord Hailes affirms that there is no evidence that the book was written by the Archbishop, and Bishop Wordsworth's view is that he 'had little or no share in the authorship.' Further, it is

pointed out by M'Crie that Bale, in his account of Scottish writers, mentions 'Joannes Wonram vel Wyrem,' whom he calls 'a canon regular in St Andrews,' and ascribes to him a 'Cathechismus Fidei' in the vernacular—'in vulgari sermone.' M'Crie has no doubt that this is our John Winram, and thinks it quite possible that he wrote 'Archbishop Hamilton's Catechism,' for not only was he one of the last to leave the old Church—and sometimes he seemed to be on the one side, and sometimes on the other—but he was a kind of pacifier, and because of his talents, mediatory influence, and reputation with the people, was employed frequently by his brother clergymen to diminish the odium of their obnoxious measures, or to recommend their partial and inefficient plans of reform. It having come to our knowledge that in the list of books belonging to the University of St Andrews a Catechism was entered in Winram's name, we wrote to Dr Maitland Anderson, the Librarian there, and his reply was to the effect that it was merely an entry in an old Manuscript Catalogue, and that the book was not known to exist. We may add that M'Crie, in a footnote to his *Life of Andrew Melville*, makes some further observations on the authorship, but his difficulty, as indicated there, is removed by Dr Anderson's communication, and also by the views expressed by Professor Mitchell, which we shall state presently.

When Mr Gladstone was Rector of Edinburgh University, he was shown a copy of Archbishop Hamilton's Catechism, and was so struck with its great historical interest that he strongly urged a fresh publication of the work. Nearly a quarter of a century elapsed, however, before Professor Mitchell of St Andrews issued a facsimile black letter reprint, in its initial letters and woodcuts, with a valuable introduction. About two

years later, in 1884, there was published by the Oxford Clarendon Press, with a preface by Mr Gladstone, an edition in modern type and style under the able editorship of Dr Thomas Graves Law, Librarian of the Signet Library, Edinburgh, whose introductory notes and glossary give added value to the book. Dr Law says, with regard to Winram's part in it, that 'whoever may have been employed in drawing up the groundwork he can hardly to any material degree have coloured with his own private opinions a book composed under the direction and supervision of the Primate and Synodal divines.' Professor Mitchell is inclined to the view that Winram had a large share in its composition, and thinks that the entry in the University Library may have reference to an original draft of the Catechism MS., or possibly to a printer's copy corrected in accordance with it. It is surely a remarkable fact that in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, and within a year or two of each other, two reprints of Archbishop Hamilton's Catechism should be published—one under the editorship of the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, and the other with an introduction by the Prime Minister of Great Britain. Archbishop Hamilton's Catechism is not to be confounded with *The Twa-Penny Faith* or *Godlie Exhortatioun*, issued by the authority of the Provincial Council in 1559. This latter was a four-page tractate, and from Archbishop Hamilton's having allowed it to be sold at the price of two pennies Scots, it received this popular designation. It should be remembered that the Catechism was intended to be a manual for the clergy, and to be systematically read *to* the people—half an hour every Sunday and holy day unless when there was a sermon—but it was to be read *by* the people only under certain precautions. Lord Hailes observes that the

Council which enacted this Catechism ‘used as many precautions to prevent it from coming into the hands of the laity as if it had been a book replete with the most pestilent heresy.’

Before we close this matter it may be well to dispose of the claims of John Mair (or Major), Provost of St Salvator’s College, to be author or part author of this important book. He could not possibly have taken part in its compilation, for the date of the Catechism is 1552, and to the Council of 1549 Mair had to send a proxy as he was ‘annosus, grandævus et debilis.’ He died in the following year.

Winram seems to have been somewhat of an Erasmus, though, unlike the great Dutchman, he took the final step and became a Protestant. He may appear to some to have been endeavouring for an inordinate length of time to find out which was the safe side of the burning bush, or, to change the igneous metaphor for an aqueous one, whether it was safer to sail in the barque of St Peter or in another craft on the Lake of Geneva. But Wodrow, at least, will not have it so. He holds that this continued consorting with the adherents of Popery was a necessary bowing down in the house of Rimmon, and naïvely remarks—‘There have been and are some of God’s children and hidden ones in Bablyon, who are to be called out of it, and no doubt Mr Winram was useful even in this period.’ We may safely say that Winram was no Vicar of Bray prepared to attach himself to either party. For those who lay stress on orders, apostolic succession, and such like, the following from Wodrow may also be quoted: ‘Even from his and some other of our reformers being in Popish orders, and continuing in them till the full light of the Reformation broke out, and their joining in that great work from inward conviction of mind, some advantage



arose to us in our debates with the papists about our ordinations.'

In the year 1559 we find Winram attending another Council of the Scottish Clergy, and in its proceedings he takes an active part.<sup>1</sup> He was nominated one of the six persons to whose examination and admonition the Archbishops of St Andrews and Glasgow submitted their private conduct. Perhaps we should say a little more about this. From Patrick's *Statutes of the Scottish Church*, and from Acts of Parliament about that time, we learn that efforts were put forth for the reformation of clerical morality. The temporal lords and barons were anxious that such purification should take place. 'Spirituale men's ungodly and dissolute lyves' had become an 'opin sclander.' Concubinage, the bestowing of ecclesiastical benefices on the sons of prelates and others of the clergy, and the endowing of their daughters with church land and money when they married men of rank, were evils that had to be stopped. Accordingly, this Council, held at Edinburgh, took up these matters, passed enactments concerning them, and enjoined the metropolitans to enforce them on their suffragans, and the bishops on the lower clergy. That the metropolitans themselves, that is, the two archbishops already named, might not escape—and they were more than suspect—it was suggested that they should submit themselves to 'the advice, inquisition, and reproof of the bishop of Dunkeld, the bishops-designate of Whithorn and Ross, John Sinclair, dean of Restalrig, John Greyson, provincial of the Black Friars, and John Winram, sub-prior of St Andrews.' It is said that the two prelates 'spontaneously submitted themselves for the good example of others,' that they might not 'seem to lay grievous burdens on their reverend suffragans and lower clergy'; but it

<sup>1</sup> See Note 4.

has been suggested that the spontaneity resulted from a broad, or even imperative, hint that was given them.

After this John Winram passed over to the side of the reformers. Possibly he had come to the conclusion that the faith, worship, and morals of the old Church were irretrievably bad. Two years before this, according to Foxe, he had been present at the trial of the aged Walter Mylne, the last of the Scottish martyrs at that time. 'This Winram,' adds the martyrologist, 'is now become a godly minister of the Church of God, and a married man.' It is noteworthy that at the time he became a Protestant, there were several other prominent clergymen in Scotland who acted similarly—among them Alexander Gordon, Bishop of Galloway (titular Archbishop of Athens), and John Greyson, Provincial of the Black Friars. This latter, on the 17th March 1560, made public and formal recantation in the parish church of St Andrews, and the account thereof is valuable for the light it throws on the nature and extent of the change of opinion that was prevailing among churchmen of the Winram type, who desired reform within the Church, and only left it when they found that reformation from within was unlikely to take place. In the same church of St Andrews—the Church of the Holy Trinity, with its twelve altars, thirty chaplains, and twelve choristers—Dean John Wilson, formerly Canon of Holyrood, also recanted, in February of the same year, in presence of the congregation 'and the Admiral of England.'

It has been affirmed that Winram brought a great many priests of St Andrews over with him to Knox's side. There is no positive proof of this, but the fact remains that at least twenty priests joined the reformed congregation in that city in 1559-60, and a still larger number were ultimately admitted as Readers in the

Reformed Church. In the same year Knox, in writing to Mrs Anna Locke, says—‘Diverse channons of Saint Andrews have given notable confessiouns, and have declared themselves manifest enemies to the pope, to the messe, and to all superstitioun.’ Eleven years after the Reformation had received Parliamentary sanction, fourteen canons of the Priory are mentioned as Protestants, and twelve of these had become parish ministers. It is to be noted, moreover, that of twenty-one men in St Andrews, whom the first General Assembly deemed qualified ‘for ministreing and teaching,’ nearly all had been professors or regents. As for the country in general, it is recorded in the *Book of the Universal Kirk* that, in 1573, the Regent Morton having learned that most of the canons, monks, and friars within the realm had made profession of the true faith (*i.e.* Protestantism), suggested that they might now be utilised as readers. Surely the influence of Winram, who was Dean and Sub-Prior, and long connected with the place, had a good deal to do with such a striking change. We cannot but think that his long delay in adhering to Protestantism was ultimately of great benefit to the cause of reform. He must have influenced those who, like himself doubtless, may have been slow to change their modes of worship, and depart from articles of the faith which for many centuries had been regarded as essential to salvation. It is possible, too, that he, and they, may have thought that reformation of the Church could be effected without what was practically a national revolution. In any case it can scarcely be doubted that for many years he must have been usefully employed in directing enquiries, and moulding the minds of the inmates of the Augustinian Monastery of which he was the head, and also of many others in and around the city of St Andrews.

There is a curious paragraph in the twenty-fifth chapter of the twenty-second book of Pitscottie's *Chronicles*, wherein we find Winram, as late as the year 1558, going on a preaching tour through Fife along with Archbishop Hamilton, Lord James Stewart, and several canons, their object being to counteract the work of the reformers ; but it is very strange to find Lord James Stewart associated with Archbishop Hamilton, stranger to find him a preacher, and still more strange to find him in that year opposing the Reformation. Auld Pitscottie must surely be 'nodding' here.

As Prior of Portmoak, Winram sat in the Scottish Parliament of 1560, which approved of the *Confession of Faith*, and we know from a letter of Thomas Randolph, the English Ambassador, to Sir William Cecil (afterwards Lord Burghley), Queen Elizabeth's Secretary of State, that Winram spoke in its support. He certainly must have been looked upon as a man of ability in Parliament, for not only from the *Diurnal of Occurents*, but from the Acts of the Scottish Parliament, we learn that later he was elected one of the Lords of the Articles ; and as such we find him appending his name to a curious document, namely, the letter that was sent by 'the Commission of the Estates to move Queen Elizabeth to take the Earl of Arran to her husband.' Keith prints the entire letter from the original preserved in the archives of the Duke of Hamilton at Hamilton Palace, but it need not be given here.

Had Winram a part in compiling the *Confession of Faith* ? The chief share in it undoubtedly fell to Knox, who was well skilled in such work. The age was creed-making—very different from to-day, when, on the one hand, some dismiss creeds as useless, and, on the other, protracted meetings of General Assemblies—with months, even years, of committee work beforehand—

appear to be necessary for the revision merely of such symbols. But the Scottish reformers completed their task in four days—at any rate it was ‘presented’ to Parliament four days after its preparation had been enjoined—and, not long before, the Huguenot ministers had met in Paris and embodied their creed and discipline in a series of eighty articles within the space of three days. Professor Hume Brown says that the same six persons—the six Johns, of whom Winram was one—who were charged to draw up the *Book of Discipline*, drafted in all probability the *Confession of Faith*; but Winram had more concern with it than that. As we have seen in one of our quotations, Knox says that Winram had to do with ‘the doctrine,’ but, from a letter written by Randolph to Cecil on 7th September 1560, it appears that to John Winram, Lord James Stewart, and William Maitland of Lethington, the work was submitted for revision, and they mitigated ‘the austeritie of manyie words and sentences which seemed to proceed of some evil conceived opinion rather than of any sound judgment.’

But Winram had a further connection with this matter. We gather from a letter of Cecil himself that certain private conferences were held with important personages in the kingdom before the Confession was finally submitted to the whole Parliament assembled. There was even an attempt made to get the Archbishop of St Andrews, the Bishop of Dunkeld, and the Bishop of Dunblane to agree to the new creed, or at least not to oppose its Parliamentary sanction. The first named, John Hamilton, was willing to discuss the matter with Winram and certain others, and this is what the letter says: ‘The Bishop of St Andrews upon motion that was made to him, was contented to talk with the Sub-Prior [John Winram], the Rector [John



Douglas], and two others. They have had much communication without hope. He is stout and bold enough. He rideth and goeth at large. He came to the Duke [of Chatelherault] to supper, etc. . . . The Duke after supper talked long with him. They concluded in these words that for his conscience he was determined in that mind that he was at present to end his life,' etc. It may be added that about this time Archbishop Hamilton sent John Brand—who had been a monk in the Abbey of Holyrood, but latterly an adherent of the reformed party, and the successor of John Craig as minister of Holyrood—with the following message to Knox, as given by Keith in his History, 'that howsoever he had introduced another form of religion and reformed the doctrine of the church, whereof it might be there was some reason, yet he should do well not to shake loose the order and policy received, which had been the work of many ages, till he was sure of a better to be settled in place thereof.'

In this Scots Confession of Faith we have a summary of the evangelical doctrine, consisting of twenty-five articles, based solely on Holy Scripture. While embodying the teaching of the great Œcumenical Councils, it lays emphasis on those doctrines of grace, of pardon, and of enlightenment through the Holy Spirit, upon which all the reformers in Great Britain and on the Continent of Europe laid stress. The age of speculation had not yet come, and, in revolt against the authority of popes and councils, the compilers were content with emphasising a few simple truths of Scripture. The preface contains not only a challenge to anyone to find within it what may be contrary to Scripture, but a promise that if such be found a correction will be made. Arranged not so much logically or systematically as historically, this Scottish Confession is remarkable

for its avoidance of abstract or technical terms, which in all likelihood is due to the fact that it had to be presented to an assemblage not of theologians or learned men, but to a Parliament—the Three Estates of the Realm—which, while consisting of many nobles and dignitaries, had also within its membership quite a number of men who had little learning, if indeed any education at all. It has been said of this Confession that the style is so easy that it reads like a good sermon in Scotch. Still, as was the manner in those days, there are in it sharp polemical thrusts at adversaries; but these also have not been lacking, even in later days, from good Scottish sermons. An interesting remark is made by Grub in his History, that ‘if the conjecture (that Winram drew up “Archbishop Hamilton’s Catechism”) be correct, it is singular that the statement of doctrine put forth by the Roman Catholic and by the Reformed Church should have been composed or modified by the same individual.’

In one of the quotations from Knox’s History inserted at the beginning of this chapter, it is stated why the *Book of Discipline* was necessary, namely, ‘that the Kirk be established in a good and godly policy,’ and Winram was one of the Committee of Six—one of the six Johns—appointed to draw it up. In the chapter on John Willock we have offered some remarks on the Book, and would only add now that its initiation did not come from the General Assembly, nor from any meeting of ministers, but from the Privy Council which ordered the matter to be taken in hand; that in less than a month it was ready; and that Dr James Walker, in his *Scottish Theology and Theologians*, says—‘in its magnificent comprehensiveness, it is one of the most remarkable compositions of a great time.’ Further, with regard to the institution of Superintendents—of

whom Winram was one—to whom the sixth chapter, is devoted, it is quite clear that the difference between them and preachers was only to be temporary owing to qualified ministers being few, and that the Superintendents itinerating could give many places the benefit of their ministry, while also they could advise and encourage such ministers as were of limited knowledge and experience. The number of ministers rapidly increased; no successors were appointed to the Superintendents first chosen; and the last of them, Erskine of Dun, Superintendent of Angus and Mearns, died in 1591.

When the first General Assembly met in December of that remarkable year 1560, Winram was not a member, but he was one of those declared to be 'prepared for ministering and teaching.' The name of his brother Robert, of Ratho, we find in the list of lay members. In the month of April, in the year following, John Winram was formally chosen Superintendent of 'Fyiff, Forthryck, and Stratherne,' by 'the commowne consent of lordis, baronis, ministeris, elderis of the saidis boundis, and others commowne pepill.' This indicates popular election, and from the Register of the Kirk-Session of St Andrews we learn that the election took place within the parish church of St Andrews.

One of his duties as Superintendent was connected with the reversal of the sentence of condemnation which, in 1540, had been passed on Sir John Borthwick for heresy. This Sir John, the younger son of William, third Lord Borthwick, was an accomplished knight, and a favourite with King James V. He had served with distinction in the army of France, where he had risen to be Lieutenant of the French King's guard. At the Scottish Court, where he was in close attendance

on the person of the King, he was styled Captain Borthwick. A scholar and a theologian, as well as a soldier, he possessed a fine library, in which were books shedding the new light, such as treatises by Erasmus, Œcolampadius, and Melanchthon. There was also on his shelves, or rather on his desk, a copy of the New Testament in English. He readily lent his books to others, and was neither ashamed nor afraid to tell of the new views of truth he had received, and to which he adhered. It was, therefore, pretty widely known that he held what were then called the 'heresies of England,' and that he had even been endeavouring to convert King James to Protestantism. Naturally Cardinal Beaton was highly displeased, and ordered Sir John to appear before the primate's tribunal at St Andrews. The suspect, knowing that this meant his life was in danger, fled to England, but his trial went on *in absentia* with much pomp and solemnity; condemnation and forfeiture were passed on him; and his effigy was ignominiously burned at the market crosses of St Andrews and Edinburgh. He had returned to Scotland in or before 1560, for at the General Assembly of that year we find that one of the members was 'presented by Sir John Borthwick to the Kirks of Aberdour and Torrie,' which by the way looks like patronage in these early days, though it may be that 'presented' only means 'recommended.' Winram must have had curious feelings when the matter of reversing the sentence came before him, for twenty years previously he had sat with Cardinal Beaton when the trial at St Andrews took place. Perhaps even then his sympathies were with the accused, but the very man upon whom the terrible sentence had been passed now comes before him—one of his old judges—to have that sentence reversed.

It may be stated that one of the charges on which Cardinal Beaton's court condemned Sir John Borthwick, was that he possessed a copy of the New Testament in English, and Sir James Melville informs us that, when the foes of James Kirkcaldy of Grange (father of the better known Sir William Kirkcaldy) wished to prejudice the King against him, they said that one of his offences was that 'he had always a New Testament in Englis in his poutche.'

When we study the records of the General Assembly, we find that there were several complaints against Winram for negligence in visiting parts of the district committed to him. But Willock and others of the Superintendents were accused of the same, which seems to show that the districts were too large,<sup>1</sup> or that the people expected too much. Besides, very poor provision had been made for their expenses, and Winram had to complain of this. Moreover, the people were rough and rude and difficult to handle.

In addition to the *Book of the Universal Kirk*—the Proceedings of the General Assembly—there is a valuable work which throws light on many of the duties of Winram as Superintendent, and that is Volume IV. of the Publications of the Scottish History Society. This and its succeeding volume contain the Register of the Kirk-Session of St Andrews from 1559 to 1600, transcribed and edited from the original manuscript with preface and notes by Dr Hay Fleming. An extraordinary state of matters is revealed by this Register. One would scarcely have imagined that the Scottish people could have fallen so deplorably, and one cannot but commend the Reformed Church for labouring so

<sup>1</sup> Winram's was very large. He had the oversight of 'Fyiff, Perth, Stratherne, Clakmannan, Kynrose, and Strevellingshire—on the north syde of Forth with Menteach.'



persistently to lift them up from such depths of immorality and ignorance. Winram had no easy post as Superintendent of Fife, and his hands soon became full. In addition to the records of the Kirk-Session we have the records of his court preserved in Volume IV. Before we give one or two extracts to show the turbulence he had to contend with, we may say that this Register is of great interest for all who are interested in the domestic affairs of Scotland in bygone days. Though Church discipline predominates—with stools of repentance ('uppermost' and 'of highest degree'), sack-cloth, white sheets ('quhyt lining'), paper caps of 'moitor' (*i.e.* mitre shape), bearing the name of the offence in large letters, culprits 'bare-heidit' and 'bare-futtit,' and delinquents with spurious communion cards ('feingyeit tikatis')—there are also references to the pillory (the 'stockis' and 'jugis'), bluegowns, and 'lions' or 'hard-heids' (a base kind of coinage). Winram is a conspicuous figure in the Register. For twelve years he and his court had to deal with many difficult questions and many difficult people. The divorce cases, and others of a worse description, that came before him we cannot speak of here, but the following will show the turbulence and impudence which at times faced him. John Melville, a brother of the famous Andrew, was minister at Crail, and he had a bitter complaint to make against the rude effrontery of a parishioner who cried out in the church one day that he should be 'pulled out of the pulpit by the lugs,' and called upon some of the stalwarts there and then to do so. One might have thought that the name of Knox would have been held in some regard, if not veneration, but a St Andrews man was charged with saying—'The devil knock out John Knox's harnes (brains) for quhen he wald see him hangit, he wald get

the Sacrament.' A woman, under discipline, exclaimed, 'The devil burn up the Kirk ere she came into it.' But Winram himself had to bear insults of a grievous kind. Here is a typical instance. An Alexander Wardlaw, son of the laird of Torrie, who had been put in charge at Ballingry before the Reformation, had been dispensing the Sacraments without having been admitted to do so by the Superintendent. Winram sent a properly qualified minister—Peter Watson—to administer the rite of Baptism there, but Wardlaw was very much displeased and declared 'that he wald not be redar to John Knox nor any other in Scotland.' When the same minister arrived to celebrate a marriage, Wardlaw forcibly prevented him, with the result that the Superintendent had to go himself though he had not much time to spare, being much engaged with other matters—with 'otheris gret besiness.' As the church was not in a good state of repair, the Superintendent admonished Wardlaw and his parishioners for such neglect, and ordered them to put the same into a satisfactory state; but on the following day at a meeting of the heritors this defiant incumbent became quite outrageous and said that 'he wald do nothing in that behalve, nor obey any admonition or command of that fals, dissaitful, greedy; and dissemblit smaik, for he (Winram), was one of thaim that most oppressed, and smoored and held down the Word (Kirk?) of God, and now he is come into it, and professing the same for grediness of gayr (geir) lurkand and watchand, quhill he may see ane other tyme.' This Ballingry parson was very ill-tempered and determined, and, in order that no other minister should officiate in his church, he actually erected a fence of Jedwood stakes in the chancel. Winram had to hand this man over to the jurisdiction of the St Andrews Session—'as to

the ministrie of the principall toun of 'his residence' —the matter affecting Winram himself. The case was duly tried, witnesses were summoned, and a procurator conducted the case for the Superintendent. Wardlaw was as rude and defiant as ever, stoutly denied the charges laid to him, and objected to the witnesses produced, though several of them were his own near relatives. In the end the Session held that there was nothing against Winram, and ordered Wardlaw, 'the pretendit parson of Ballingry,' for his 'blasphemous speaking againis the Superintendent of Fife,' to confess publicly his fault in the parish church of St Andrews and ask God's mercy and the Superintendent's forgiveness ; also, on the following Sunday, to 'comeir in lyke manner in the parroche Kirk of Ballingry' and confess, etc. ; and these things to be done by 'the said Mr Alexander under the payne of excommunicacion with all severitie.'

We learn from the Register that Winram was frequently present at meetings of the Kirk-Session. In cases pertaining to the parish, the decision come to runs in the name of the Session ; but in cases pertaining to Winram's large district, the decisions run in his name and with his advice. In course of time he became tired of the office of Superintendent, and asked the General Assembly to accept of his resignation. After refusing for some time, they at length consented. He was reappointed, however, after a short interval ; and it is of some significance, as pointing to anything but inefficiency, that, in 1576, when it was thought expedient to appoint annual visitors and commissioners, with changes of bounds to prevent 'ambitions and inconveniences in the Church,' Winram was continued in his Fife Superintendence. It should also be remembered that, in most of the complaints against him, we have not his replies to his defamers. The Assembly

recognised his merits as a peace-maker, and more than once he was appointed to reconcile persons and places. For instance, when a dispute arose, with much bad feeling, between Dundee and Montrose—‘there happened a threatening breach between them’—Winram was despatched by the General Assembly to pour oil on the troubled waters. It is to be noted that on more than one occasion at places visited he is styled ‘Lord Superintendent.’

Winram was a diligent attender of the General Assembly. In the whole course of thirty-six of them he was never once absent. It is surprising, therefore, that, with all his learning and knowledge of affairs, we do not find his name in the list of Moderators. We learn from the Acts of the Scottish Parliament that in 1563 he was a member of the Commission appointed to enquire into the state of the University of St Andrews, and some years later (1578) the Acts also inform us that he similarly visited the Universities of St Andrews, Aberdeen, and Glasgow.

At this stage we may say something of Winram’s private or domestic life. He married, on the 12th July 1564, Margaret Stewart, widow of John Aytoun of Kinaldy. According to the Lists of the Sons and Daughters of the Celibate Clergy recorded to have been legitimated between the years 1529 and 1559—which Lists may still be seen in the MS. *Register of the Privy Seal*—she was the daughter of ‘quondam the reverend father in Christ, Alexander, Bishop of Moray and Commendator of the Monastery of Scone.’ In Pollen’s *Papal Negotiations*, we have the following reference to the marriage, by Nicholas de Gouda: ‘While I was there one of those Superintendents, a leading man amongst them, a doctor of theology and a monk, then about seventy years of age, was openly

married. This was done to enforce by example, as he had often done by precept, their doctrine of the unlawfulness of the vow of chastity, which they are perpetually trumpeting from the pulpit.' Though not rich, it would appear from her last will and testament that the lady had a little money of her own. There were no children of the marriage, but by her previous husband she had several sons. Mrs Winram predeceased her second husband, dying on 5th March 1573. The stepfather and stepsons do not appear to have got on well. They had disputes about property as we gather from the Book of the Commissariat of St Andrews. According to the *Register of Ministers, Exhorters, and Readers*, Winram's emoluments, as Superintendent of Fife, were—'quheit ij chalderis, beir v chalderis, aitis iij chalderis, meil ij chalderis, money V<sup>c</sup> merkis.'

His home was within the Priory of St Andrews, for we learn from the *Protocol Book* of John Scott, a notary of that town, that in 1565[-66] 'Mr Jhone Wynram, Superintendit of Fyff occupeit the little yard quhilke was callit the commoun yard of the said abbay at the eist,' and in 1573 an entry in the same book refers to 'the Superintendentis chalmer within the abbay of St Androis.' Several of the old canons—some of them by this time married—also lived within the precincts of the Priory. The buildings, though hastening to ruin, were spacious, with girnals, orchards, and dovecots. The Earl and Countess of Moray resided within the venerable pile for some time after the Reformation, and Winram, two years before his death, must have seen a gay and royal sight, for in the year 1580 no less a personage than His Majesty King James VI. came to stay for a little in the *hospitium novum* of the Priory. The King's grandmother, Mary of Guise, had spent her honeymoon in the same *hospitium*, and it



was said to have been built for the reception of James V.'s first Queen, Magdalene, the tradition being that the physician selected the place as peculiarly suited for a princess so lovely, but, alas! so delicate. If the Priory was still furnished and upholstered as it was in the Earl of Moray's time—an inventory of which still remains—and Winram fell heir to some of that furniture and upholstery for his apartments, he would be comfortably, though perhaps not sumptuously, housed in the old Priory.

Nearly all the time that Winram held the office of Superintendent he was also Prior of Portmoak, more correctly of St Serf's, Lochleven; and this apparently gave him considerable standing, for, as we have seen, it was as such that he was a member of Parliament in 1560. We learn, moreover, from the Register of the Privy Council, that as Prior of Portmoak he was present at the Perth Convention of 27th July 1569; and as late as 1574, on the 5th March of that year, he, still as Prior, attended a Convention held at Holyrood House, at which he was one of those nominated to draw up the *Second Book of Discipline*. At the same time Parliament appointed him a member of the Commission charged with the duty of carrying into effect the reformation of the University of St Andrews as then agreed upon. Winram was evidently an authority on University affairs, for, before the Reformation, in the years 1544, 1545, and 1550 respectively, he was a member of the Committees for visiting St Leonards, and took an active part in the proceedings. On the 29th July 1580, he conveyed—or he resigned it, and there was conveyed—the Priory of Portmoak along with the barony of Kirkness and other properties pertaining to it, to St Leonard's College.<sup>1</sup> Winram's

<sup>1</sup> See Note 5.

stipend as Superintendent, his marriage with a lady of the position of Mrs Aytoun—sometimes called Lady Kinaldy—and the revenues accruing to him from Portmoak, all point, we think, to the conclusion that he was a man in comparatively affluent circumstances.

The year 1565 must have been one ever memorable in the life of John Winram, for in that year there were interviews between him and Queen Mary. He was twice in the royal presence. The first occasion was on the 13th May. Knox tells us about it in his History. Other two Superintendents accompanied Winram, and Her Majesty 'cherished them with fair words, assuring them that she desired nothing more earnestly than the glory of God, and the satisfying of men's consciences, and the good of the Commonwealth ; and, albeit she was not persuaded in any Religion but in that wherein she was brought up, yet she promised to them that she would hear conference and disputation on the Scriptures ; and, likewise, she would be content to hear public preaching, but always out of the mouths of such as pleased Her Majesty ; and, above all others, she said she would gladly hear the Superintendent of Angus (for he was a mild and sweet-natured man with true honesty and uprightness), John Erskine of Dun.' The second interview was in December of the same year, when the General Assembly was in session. Along with some others—and 'a certain number of the most able men'—Winram was appointed by the General Assembly to go to Holyrood Palace, and lay the matter of the paltry stipends of the ministers before the Queen. Some of them, it appeared, were at starvation point—'like to perish or leave their ministry.' The deputies were graciously received—'easily obtained audience of their Majesties, Mary and Henry (Darnley)'—but we are told that the Queen's answer was 'in the old

manner,' that is, excuses were pleaded, promises were made only to be broken, delays interposed, and nothing in the end was done. Knox, in commenting on the proceedings, practically says that Queen Mary's thoughts were elsewhere; provision for the Protestant clergy was nothing to her; the ministers might starve, but there must be plenty of eating and drinking and jollity in her palace, and with her friends. 'In the meantime,' he writes, 'the Queen was busied banqueting with some of the Lords of Session in Edinburgh, and after with all men of law, having continually in her company David Rizzio, who sat at table next herself, sometime more privately than became a man of his condition'; and many banquets a few weeks after were given in honour of Seigneur de Rambouillet, the French Ambassador, who came in state in order to bestow the Order of the Cockle from the King of France upon 'the King [Henry, Darnley], who received the same at the Masse in the Chapelle of the Palace of Holuryd-house.' We would add that from this interview of Winram with Queen Mary we obtain a notable testimony to the scholarship and dialectic prowess of the Protestant ministers. The deputation having asked the Queen if she would welcome to her audience-chamber some of the ministers to a discussion on matters of Faith and Ritual with some of the Roman Catholic clergy, she would not consent, saying that 'she would not jeopard her Religion upon such as were there present; for she knew well enough that the Protestant ministers were more learned.'

Winram's attitude towards Queen Mary's having the Mass celebrated at Holyrood was that of Lord James Stewart, rather than that of John Knox. The matter troubled the nobility, and a conference took place between 'the Lords' and certain representative

ministers. Winram was present, and John Knox as well; Maitland of Lethington was also there; and, after a good deal of speaking on both sides, Lethington, addressing the Lord Chancellor, who presided, said—‘My Lord Chancellor, ask ye the votes, and take by course everyone of the ministers, and every one of us.’ The Rector of St Andrews was ‘first commanded to speak to his conscience,’ and said, ‘I refer to the Superintendent of Fife, for I think we are both of one judgment, and yet if ye will that I speak first, my conscience is this. If the Queen opposes herself to our religion, which is the only true religion, the Nobility and Estates of this realm, professors of the true doctrine, may justly oppose themselves to her. But, as concerning her own Mass, albeit I know it is idolatry, I am not yet resolved, whether or not we may take it from her by violence.’ The Superintendent of Fife, John Winram, then said, ‘That is my conscience.’ So also affirmed some of the nobility. But others ‘voted frankly’ and said that, ‘as the Mass was an abomination it was just and right that it should be suppressed; and that in so doing, men did no more wrong to the Queen’s Majesty than would they that should, by force, take from her a poisoned cup when she was going to drink it.’<sup>1</sup>

There was an interview with Kirkcaldy of Grange and Maitland of Lethington in Edinburgh Castle at which Winram was present, and on which Hill Burton in his *History of Scotland* lays stress, devoting several pages to it. We are indebted to Bannatyne’s *Memoriales* for a detailed account of what took place. The year was 1571, and Knox was in poor health, having had an apoplectic fit the year before. At that time, too, he was in great danger from the assassin’s dagger. It

<sup>1</sup> Knox’s *History* (Laing’s edition), vol. ii. pp. 455-6.

was in this very year that, one night, a shot was fired into his house, which only missed its mark by Knox having for a little risen from the chair in which he usually sat. But the Reformer feared none of these things, and frail though he was, roused himself for this meeting in the Castle with his former fast, now, alas ! doubtful, friends—Sir William Kirkcaldy of Grange and William Maitland of Lethington. The object of the visit was, if possible, to get the Queen's party and the Regent's to come to some understanding. The errand was hopeless, but the narrative of the meeting in these old *Memoriales* is most interesting. It begins thus : ' At our entry to the Castle (Knox doubtless is narrator) we passed to the great hall on the south side, where soon Sir James Balfour came to us, and incontinent thereafter the lord duke [Chatelherault], and last captain of the castle [Kirkcaldy], who desired my lord duke and us to enter within the chamber within the said hall, where the lord secretary [Lethington] was sitting before his bed in a chair.' The last, indeed, was far from well, suffering from paralysis, but his intellect was as strong and nimble as ever. Colour and pathos are given to the picture by the sufferer having a little dog on his knee which, doubtless, he would fondle at times. Winram accompanied Knox, who had also with him John Craig, his colleague in St Giles'.

When the time came for conferring, it was Winram who opened the proceedings with the words : ' Perceiving the intestine troubles in the Commonwealth ' his brethren ' thought it became them of their duty to offer their labours and travails, to the end that if it should please God that thereby the same might be stanchd, for the which we are come here to offer our travails and labours as said is,' and ' after silence was



kept a certain space ' Knox said that they had better now proceed to business, and asked 'heads or articles' as a 'ground on which they may travail.' We need not give the arguments and explanations used on each side, more especially as nothing further from Winram is recorded, and the whole discussion was futile and fruitless. Knox showed his old skill in debating, as also did Lethington. When the latter spoke of the setting up of the Regency as 'bot ane fetch or shift to save us from great inconvenientis,' the great Reformer, knowing his man well—his shifting policies, his subtle devices, his hypocrisy—replied in these noble words: 'My lord, I cannot tell what fetches or shifts your lordship has used in these proceedings; but hereunto let your own conscience accuse yourself before God, *conscientiam vestram oneramus*. But one thing well I wot, honest men of simple conscience and upright dealing meant nothing of your shifts and fetches, but proceeded upon an honest and constant ground, having the glory of God before their eyes, and the punishment of horrible crimes.' Yet, in spite of this indignant and deserved retort, and with sword-thrusts many in this 'great diplomatic conference,' as Hill Burton calls it, there was really little loss of temper, and, at the conclusion, the whole company 'began to mow (jest) and, as it were, every ane to lauch upon ane other, and so we raise.' But it was ultimately a very serious business for some of that company, especially for one—the Captain of the Castle, Sir William Kirkcaldy of Grange.

It is well to know what John Knox thought of his fellow-worker. We have very little to go upon, but it is so far satisfactory that we have something in a letter which Knox wrote a few months before his death, in 1572, to the General Assembly then convened at Perth.

The letter, which Calderwood inserts in his *History of the Kirk of Scotland*, is brief, for Knox's poor health prevented his writing at any length; but he says in it that he has 'communicated' his 'mind' to 'two deare brethren' who will give further information to the Assembly. The Reformer was troubled over certain matters affecting the Church, and wished the Assembly to come to some decision regarding them. The 'two deare brethren' are John Winram and Robert Pont, and they drew up a paper of some length (which Calderwood also prints in his *History*) containing 'articles' and 'questions' to be submitted to the Supreme Court. The Assembly 'diligently considered' them, found them 'reasonable and godlie,' took order for their furtherance, and sent a reply to their 'deare brother in the Lord Jesus' by the hands of Winram, Pont, Erskine of Dun, and one or two others. What more immediately concerns us is that the terms of Knox's letter show that he held Winram in affectionate esteem, and had full confidence in him. Buchanan, in his *History*, speaks of him as 'a venerable superintendent who laboured long and successfully in the cause of the reformed.'

At the Convention held at Leith in 1572 the Regent Morton<sup>1</sup> arranged for the setting up of his *tulchan* Bishops. This was a new and very strange ecclesiastical arrangement—made up of presbytery, episcopacy, and monasticism—which in some respects might seem harmless enough, but in others was fraught with the greatest dangers to the liberties of the Scottish Church. A scandalous arrangement in origin and intent, the bishops under it were well named *tulchan*, in allusion to the custom, in Scottish rural districts, of placing a

<sup>1</sup> Morton was not actually Regent till later in the year, but we give him here his well-known designation.

calf-skin stuffed with straw to induce cows to give their milk, for so would these curiously made bishops—mere sham—draw the wealth of the benefices to the court and the nobles. The part that Winram played in all this was as follows. As a Superintendent he was present at the Leith Convention, and he was instructed by the General Assembly to inaugurate<sup>1</sup> John Douglas as *tulchan* Archbishop of St Andrews. Professor Hume Brown says that the Assembly really could not quarrel with the Regent Morton at that time, for the very existence of the Church seemed to depend on him. It fell to Winram as Superintendent of the bounds to perform the ceremony of inauguration, and, according to Wodrow, he preached from Titus i., and used the same form that had been drawn up by Knox, and appointed by the Assembly twelve years before for the reception of Superintendents. Noticeable is it that thereafter (at least, as long as John Douglas lived) Winram ceases to be Superintendent of Fife, and is only Superintendent of Strathearn. He is also now spoken of as Archdeacon of the diocese.

What his feelings were in connection with this Tulchan business we have no means of knowing, but at a meeting of Parliament held about that time at Stirling he speaks for those who held by the rights and privileges of the Church. The little King, James VI.—but a child—was brought into this Parliament, and, noticing something strange or unusual about it, the infant Solomon, as a presage of the royal sapience of after-days, piped out, ‘I think there is a hole in this Parliament.’<sup>2</sup> Be that as it may, the Earl of Morton was its

<sup>1</sup> ‘Inaugurat, as they cald it.’ James Melville, in his *Diary*, who was present.

<sup>2</sup> The remark was suggested by the monarch noticing a hole in the cloth which covered the table.

master, and introduced the tulchan bishops, demanding that the new archbishop of St Andrews should, at least, have a vote. But the ministers present were strongly opposed to this, and 'Mr Winram, as Superintendent of Fife, was desired by them to, and accordingly did, solemnly inhibit Mr John Douglas to sit and vote in Parliament in the name of the Kirk till he should be admitted by the Kirk.'

In this same year, at a meeting of the General Assembly at St Andrews, we find the following incident taking place as recorded by Wodrow in his *Collections*. 'At that same dyet, Mr Rutherford, Provost of St Salvator's College, compleand that the Superintendent of Fife had disposed of the vicarage of Kilmany, which belonged to him, the Provost and Colledge; and that Mr Winram had dispoined an altarage in the Kirk of St Andrews which was also their gift, as appeared by the foundation yet extant.' The Assembly took the matter into consideration, appointed a committee to report on it, and, thereafter 'ordered a letter to be writt to the Lords Senators of the College of Justice' informing them what they had done. According to Bannatyne's *Memoriales*, before Knox left St Andrews for Edinburgh, in 1572, he had a private meeting at his lodgings, John Winram being present along with the *tulchan* Archbishop of St Andrews, the Bishop of Caithness, the Principal of St Salvator's, and Mr Archibald Hamilton. Important matters affecting the Church were discussed and Knox, doubtless aggrieved and annoyed at the Regent Morton's interference with spiritual offices and usages, uttered a warning against interference and control from another quarter. 'I protest,' he said at this meeting, 'that nather the pulpet at Sanct Androis, nather yit of any congregation within the realme, be subject to the

censure of the schools, universitie, or facultie within the same ; but only that it be reserved to God, the Judge of All, and to the Generall Assemblie gatherit within the same realme lauchfullie.'

It may be mentioned that there are three references to Winram in the Register of the Privy Council. The first is in 1572[-73], when he appears in a case connected with the disposal of a 'donation' to a student at St Andrews. Winram thought he had the right to grant to Robert Wilkie, his cousin, this 'donation' as it pertained to the 'chappellaurie' of St John the Evangelist within St Salvator's College, but the Provost of St Salvator's disputed this, and granted the 'donation' to James Fiddes, a 'puyr student for some support to him in claythis and bukis.' The matter was argued before the Council, and the decision was adverse to Winram. The second case (year 1575[-76]) has reference to the presentation of Thomas Wood to the vicarage of St Andrews. For some reason Winram had declined to 'gif and grant admission,' but the Council directed him to do so. In the third case (year 1579) his name merely appears as one of a commission appointed to reform the University of St Andrews. It is interesting to note, in these proceedings of the Privy Council, that the first name in the Sederunt is that of *Jacobus Dominus Regens* (i.e. the Earl of Morton).

In 1575 Winram was appointed by the Assembly one of a committee to 'frame an act anent ministers' apparel.'

Archbishop Douglas having died, the Regent Morton, in 1576, acted in a very high-handed manner in providing an Archbishop for St Andrews who should have no dependence on the General Assembly. To that office he appointed Patrick Adamson, a man learned and talented, bold and ambitious. There



was no election, no ceremony of admission, no consultation with the Assembly. Merely a mandate was given by the Regent, possession was taken by Adamson, and he began at once to exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction, especially in Fife. The Church was greatly displeased. Grave men in the Assembly saw what had been involved in the appointment of Douglas, and that the Regent now meant the establishment of an unlimited episcopacy. The Assembly appointed a commission with powers to deal with Adamson for his conduct, and Winram was nominated one of the Commissioners. But the Superintendent was in poor health—he was now an old man—and the Assembly, aware of his failing strength, appointed two other ministers to act for him in the event of his not being able to take part in the proceedings.

A balladist of that time introduces Winram in connection with this Adamson affair. The place is St Andrews, and the poet or rhymster is Robert Sempill. The title of the poem or 'ballate' is—'The Legend or Discourss of the Lyfe and Conversatione and Qualiteis of the Tulchene Bishope of Sanctandrois.' Sempill held Adamson in very low esteem, exposes the craft by which he accomplished his ambitious projects, and rails on him for his many vices. He shows him to be a deceiver and a forger, and among his dupes he places the aged John Winram. The following lines—which exhibit the archbishop as a true *tulchan* and worse—are the parts of the 'ballate' in which reference is made to Winram :—

' This foirsaid bischope [Douglas] beand deid,  
Maister Jhone Wynrome was maid heid,  
For sowmes of silver that he had lent them ;  
Bot he besoght thame to content them :  
He cravit na dignities prophane,  
Bot his awin silver hame agane.

Fra Holiglass <sup>1</sup> sone hard this thing.  
 He toned his dussie for a spring,<sup>2</sup>  
 And held the Regent [Morton] so in hand  
 And maid him weill to understand  
 That he suld pay the foirsaid sowme  
 Gif he were enterit in the rowme ;  
 And mair, as he wald bid him doe,  
 To give his servants pensiones toe.  
 Sua with his craft, this carlingis pett  
 Hes fangit ane grit fisch in his nett.  
 Bot fra he was a bischope stylit,  
 Mr Jhone Wynrome was beguylit,  
 Had he not had a sure probatione  
 And cald him on his obligatione.'

Sempill then goes on to say that with many 'trickis and delatouris' (delays), and by going to a young clerk, 'a simple boy,' who was

'The Regent's awin cubicular (chamberlain)  
 His servant and his secretare  
 And him besoght to lat him see  
 Of missive wrytingis two or thrie,  
 And hecht (promised) him crownes to accord.'

The lad unsuspectingly handed Adamson the documents, which the latter manipulated and falsely signed to serve his purpose. Winram was greatly surprised when the papers came into his hands in this form, and so too were the members of the Kirk-Session of St Andrews :—

'To Maister Wynrome they compleaned,  
 Wha swair that he had never sene it,  
 And tuik in hand for to impryve it.'

But further details of Archbishop Adamson's shameful

<sup>1</sup> Holiglass (*i.e.* Adamson) = owl-glass, a term then used as a synonym for a crafty knave.

<sup>2</sup> Equivalent to, He set about accomplishing his end by fawning and fair promises. *Dussie* = *duchet*, a musical instrument (O. Fr. *doucet*, Lat. *dulcis*). *Spring*, a tune.

doings, as reported in verse by Robert Sempill,<sup>1</sup> need not be given, more especially as John Winram's name is not again introduced.

We do not hear much—if anything—of Winram after this. From a 'decreet of the Lords of Session against the tenants of Portmoak,' we learn that he died on the 18th September 1582—'umquhil Mr John Winram . . . of veritie departed this mortal life upon the XVIIIth September last.' There is probably, however, a slight mistake in the date, for the 28th September has been claimed as the day of his death. John Scott, whose *Protocol Book* has already been referred to, says in the notes on current events prefixed to his book, that on 'Fryday, the XXVIII day of September 1582 ane hon[orable] and worshipfull man Mr Jhonne Wynram, sum tyme Subpryor of St Androis abbay, Superintendent efterwart of Fyff, and Pryor of Portmoak, departit from this lyff, and was bureit in St Leonardis Kirk. And the samyn day ane wyis and leirnit man Mr George Buchanan deid at Edinbrucht.' As we know that the latter died on the 28th of September John Scott likely gives the correct date, a figure—one of the two X's—having probably been omitted *per incuriam* by the writer of the 'decreet.' Winram's will is still extant, but it is difficult to decipher, and there appears to be nothing in it of interest to the student of those times. He left as his principal heirs James Winram and John Winram of Craigton, sons of Robert Winram, of Ratho, his brother.<sup>2</sup> He was buried 'within

<sup>1</sup> The whole poem will be found in *Satirical Poems of the Reformation* (Scottish Text Society), vols. iii., iv.

<sup>2</sup> 'The abulzimentis of his body, by the airschip, were estimat to XL*li*., the silverwark XL*li*., utencils, and domicilis, LXXX*li*., his haill bukes XX*li*., awand for aill XLIX*li*., to a flesscheur Xiiij*li*., for saip and vinegar iij*li*.. Frie geir, d.d., iiijcXLVj*li* xiijs. iiijd.'—Scott's *Fasti*.

the chapel of St Leonard's College—till recently roofless and ruinous—where his tombstone can still be seen, though defaced and diminished by the ravages of time and weather. In the year 1838, when much rubbish, around and within the building, was cleared away, the stone was uncovered and almost the entire inscription was legible. It was then given as follows:—*Round the border*: M. JOHANI . WYNRAMO . CÆNOBIARCHÆ . CONVERSIS . REBVS . FIFANORVM . EPISCOPO . ANN . ÆTATIS . SVÆ . 90 . OCCVMBENTI . POSITVM. *Above the shield*: [VITA] . PIETATE . [INSIGN]IS . GENERE . AMPLA . PROPINQVIS . CONSILIO . NVNC . TVMVLI . REPPERIT . ACTA . MODVM. *Under the shield*: MVLTA . CVM . DEAMBVLAVERIS . DEMVM . REDEVNDVM . EST . HAC . CON-DITIONE . INTRAVI . VT . EXIREM.

But there are evidently errors in the above. There should be a stroke above N in Johani:—J O H A N N I, to indicate that the letter is doubled. Then in No. 2 (above the shield) the transcriber has gone grievously astray, inasmuch as he has supposed the words to be prose, whereas they form an elegiac couplet, and might be restored thus:—

[VITA . FIDE . AC] . PIETATE . [GRAV]IS . GENERE .  
AMPLA . PROPINQVIS

CONSILIO . HUNC . TVMVLI . REPPERIT . ACTA . MODVM.

For NUNC, in the transcriber's version, we have substituted HUNC, 'hic modus tumuli' being a poetical way of expressing 'hic finis mortalis in hoc tumulo.' With these corrections we would submit the following as a free translation of the whole. *Round the border*: In memory of John Winram (literally, placed to Master J. W.), Prior, and after the Reformation, Superintendent of Fife (literally, Bishop of the Fife men), who died in the ninetieth year of his age. *Above the shield*: A life venerable through faith and piety, dignified through

lineage, lived in wisdom, has here found its end in the tomb ; or, in verse :—

One known for goodness, faith and wisdom clear,  
Sprung from an honourable line, at last lies here.

*Under the shield :* When thou hast had thy long walk, thou must return. The condition of my entering [life] was that I should make an exit.

It may be added that on the shield are a dice-box and a ram, with evident allusion to what was then supposed to be the origin of—or it may be a playful device on—the name of him whom the stone commemorates ; and within the shield, beneath the dice-box and ram, is the date 1582.

When Dean Stanley visited St Andrews he was taken ‘a round of the ruins’—to use the favourite expression of Dr Chalmers when professor there—and when Winram’s stone was pointed out to him, he was arrested and somewhat amused by the words ‘*conversis rebus*’ on it. Both in his *Lectures on the History of the Church of Scotland* and in his *Addresses and Sermons delivered at St Andrews*, he refers to the phrase, and in the latter volume thus moralises : ‘It is the boast on the gravestone of old John Winram, who lies in the grass-grown cemetery of St Leonard’s, that all through the storms of the Reformation, “*conversis rebus*,” “under the ruins of a world turned upside down,” he had remained the Sub-prior of St Andrews. That same boast may still, in a nobler and wider sense than these words were used of that stubborn or pliant ecclesiastic, belong to the local genius of St Andrews, that through all the manifold changes of the Scottish Church—Culdee, Catholic, Protestant, Episcopalian, Presbyterian—its spiritual identity has never been



altogether broken, its historical grandeur never wholly forfeited.' But did the Dean read the inscription aright? In any case, we do not think that John Winram was ever known, after the Reformation, as Sub-Prior or Prior of St Andrews; but the title, or designation, as given to him in these after years, had reference to the Priory of Portmoak, or St Serf's, which, as we have seen, he conveyed—or he resigned it and it was conveyed—to St Leonard's College in 1580.

No works of Winram have come down to the present day, unless 'Archbishop Hamilton's Catechism.' We give in the appendix his sermon at Wishart's trial, and his part in the debate with Knox at St Andrews. In a letter by Bishop Sage to a Mr John Guillan, of 9th March 1702, we find it said: 'George Robertson, our friend, I remember told me he had seen a MS., a piece written by Mr John Winram, Superintendent of Fife, but I have forgot the subject.' One wonders what the 'piece' was. It is a pity for us that the Bishop's memory was not better.

It is not easy to characterise this Reformer. Dr M'Crie says in his *Life of Andrew Melville*: 'During these transactions (matters pertaining to Melville) several distinguished men were removed by death. In the year 1582, John Winram, Sub-Prior of the Abbey of St Andrews and Superintendent of Fife, died at an advanced age. Though inclined to the reformed sentiments at an early period, he retained his station in the popish church till its overthrow. His timidity and temporising conduct were often blamed by the Protestants, and afforded a topic of invective against him to the Roman Catholics, when he at last deserted their communion. He appears to have been a man of mild dispositions, considerable learning, and great influence.' In his *Lectures on the History of the Church of Scotland*,

Principal Lee gives a curious and indeed self-contradictory estimate of him, at one time praising, at another dispraising, him. But, doubtless, there is truth in this observation of the Principal: 'The conversion of a man who held so high a rank in the Church of Rome must have made a strong impression in the country; and perhaps the Reformers thought it necessary to make a sacrifice to public opinion, by assigning one of the chief offices to a man who stood high in the estimation of the world.'

Perhaps M'Crie's description, 'a man of mild dispositions,' fitly characterises Winram. He was a mediating and moderating force. Evidently a lover of peace, he was neither a John Knox nor an Andrew Melville. A great friend of the latter, Professor John Johnston,<sup>1</sup> already referred to in the Appendix to the previous chapter, has a poem on Winram. As very likely Melville was Johnston's ideal, he passes something like censure on Winram's shrinking from courageous witness-bearing. His date is wrong, the train of thought is not very clear, and the verse is rather clumsy; but we give the poem, and a translation of it.

#### JOHANNES VIN-RAMVS

Cœnobii Augustinianorum olim Præfectus apud Andreanos,  
postea inter Christi Ministros: obit senex XXIIX Septemb.  
1581.

Quo te censu hominum, quo te, Vin-Rame, reponam  
In numero? hic multum est anxia mens animi.  
Se prodit Pietas, neque turbida lucis imago est:  
Spargit enim de se lumina clara sui.

---

<sup>1</sup> Not to be confounded with another friend of Andrew Melville, Arthur Johnston, whose Latin verse sheds lustre on Scottish classical scholarship.

Quin te aperi tandem manifesto in lumine. Pelle  
 Turbidulos sensus, cumque pudore metus.  
 Cum pietate etenim postquam se nubila miscet  
 Mens hominum, lucis deperit ille vigor.  
 Gaudet agens Pietas manifesta in luce. Nec illa  
 Sit Pietas, quæ haud pro scit Pietate mori.

## JOHN WINRAM

Formerly Head of the Augustinian Convent at St Andrews, afterwards among the ministers of Christ, died an old man on 28th September 1581. †

Winram, 'tis hard, I must confess, to find  
 What rank and class to thee should be assigned.  
 Religion hates concealment ; and the light  
 That streams from Heaven above so clear and bright,  
 Should also by reflection shed its rays  
 From Christ's disciples in their words and ways.  
 Forth then into the light ! Far from thee clear  
 All troubled feelings, all false shame and fear.  
 If through dense mental clouds Religion's ray  
 Be filtered, then that light soon fades away.  
 True faith loves light. On all religion fie,  
 That will not dare for what it thinks to die !

As to Winram's 'considerable learning' there is no doubt. In this chapter, and more particularly in its earlier part, we have given abundant proof that he was a scholar, was at home with scholarly men, and on matters scholastic and academic was an authority. That he was a man of 'great influence' is shown by the various offices he held, and the leading part he took in important transactions of Church and State.

## APPENDIX

### NOTE 1

#### THE NAME WINRAM

One of the foremost authorities on surnames, Professor Ernest Weekley, has kindly written me as follows :—

‘ UNIVERSITY COLLEGE,  
NOTTINGHAM,  
22 . ii . ’11.

Dear Sir,

It is impossible to say what is the origin of *Winram*—*Winraham*—unless we know which is the original medieval form. If the former, it is no doubt formed, like Shake-spear, Make-peace, etc., as a nickname for a man who had *won* the *ram* in a wrestling contest (see Chaucer’s *Prologue*, description of the Miller). But *Winraham* might be local—the *ham*, or homestead in the *whin-ray*, i.e. the corner (ME. *wro*, *wra*) where whins grow. Whinray, Whin-ray, Winnery, etc., is an existing surname, cf. Thackeray, Thackura, etc.—Yours faithfully,

ERNEST WEEKLEY.

The Rev. Kirkwood Hewat, M.A.’

### NOTE 2

#### WINRAM’S SERMON AT THE TRIAL OF GEORGE WISHART

‘ Dene Johne Wynreme stode up in the pulpete, and maid a sermon to all the congregatioun there then assembled, taking his mater out of the xiiij chaptour of Matthew : whose sermon was devided into four principall partes.

‘ The First was a schorte and breaif declaratioun of the Evangelist. The Secound, of the interpretatioun of the good seid, and becaus he called the Word of God the good seid, and Heresye the evil seid, he declared what Heresye was, and how it should be knowin. He defyned it on this maner : “ Heresye

is a fals opinioun, defended with pertinacie cleirlye repugning to the Word of God." The Third parte of his sermon was, the caus of Heresy within that realme, and all other realmes. "The caus of Heresy (quod he) is the ignorance of thame which have the care of menis saules, to whom it necessarlie belongeth to have the trew understanding of the Word of God, that they may be able to wyn agane the fals doctonris of heresy, with the sword of the Spreat, which is the Word of God; and not only to wyn agane bot also to owircum:—as sayis the Apostle Paull, 'A bishope must be faltles, as becometh the minister of God, not stubburne, not angrie, no drunkard, no fighter, not gevin to filthy lucre; but harberous, one that loveth goodness, sober-mynded, rychteous, holy, temperat, and such as cleaveth unto the trew word of the doctrine that he may be able to exhort with holsome learning, and to improve that which thei say against him.'" The Fourte parte of his Sermon was, how Heresy should be known. "Heresyes (quod he) be knawin on this maner. As the goldsmyth knowith the fyne gold from the unperfate, by the touchstone, that is, the trew, syncere, and undefyled Word of God." At the last he added, "That heretikis should be putt down in this present lyeff: to the which proposition the Gospell appeired to repunge whilk he entreated of, Lett thame boith grow unto the harvist." The harvest is the end of the world; nevertheless, he affirmed, that thei should be putt down by the Civile Magistrat and law.

'And when he ended his sermon, incontinent, thei caused Maister George [Wishart] to ascend into the pulpit, there to heir his Accusatioun and Articles, for rycht against him stood up . . . a monstre, Johune Lawder [a very different type from John Winram] ladin full of cursingis written in paper, . . . threatnynges, maledictionis, and wordes of devilles spyte and malice, saying to the innocent Maister George so many cruell and abominable wordis, and hit him so spytfullie with the Pope's thunder, that the ignorant people dreded least the earth then wold have swallowed him up quick.'—Knox's *History* (Laing's edition), vol. i. pp. 150, 151.

Pitscottie also gives the sermon in his *Chronicles* (Book xxii. chapter 12) in practically the same words as Knox, and his remarks on John Lauder are similar.



## NOTE 3

WINRAM'S DEBATE WITH KNOX 'IN SANCT LEONARDIS  
YARDIS,' ST ANDREWS

'The Articles (*i.e.* certain Teachings) of the Reformers having been submitted, Sub-Prior Winram said: "The strangeness of these Articles, which ar gaddered forth of your doctrin, have moved us to call for you, to hear your awin answeres." John Knox said, "I for my parte, praise my God that I see so honorable, and appearandlie so modest and quiet ane auditure. But because it is long since that I have heard, that ye ar one that is not ignorant of the treuth, I man crave of you in the name of God, yea, and I appell to your conscience befor that Supreme Judge, that if ye think any Article thare expressed contrarious unto the treuth of God, that ye oppose yourself plainlie unto it, and suffer nott the people to be tharewith deceaved. But, and yf in your conscience ye know the doctrine to be trew, then will I crave your patrocinye thareto; that, by your authoritie, the people may be moved the rather to believe the trewth, whareof many dowbtes be reasin of your yowght (youth, or, perhaps, thought)."

'The Sub-Prior answered. "I came not to hear as a Judge, but only familiarly to talk; and thairfor I will neither allow nor condempne; but yf ye list, I will reesone. Why may nott the Kirk (said he) for good causes, devise Ceremonies to decore the Sacramentis, and other Goddis service?" John Knox. "Because the Kirk awght to do nothing, butt in fayth, and awght not to go befor, but is bound to follow the voce of, the trew Pastor." The Sub-Prior. "It is in fayth that the Ceremonies are commanded, and thei have proper significationis to help on fayth; as the hardis in Baptisme signifie the rawchness [righteousness?] of the law, and the oyle the softness of Goddis mercy, and lykwyse, every ane of the Ceremonyes has a godly signification, and tharefor thei boyth proceed frome fayth and ar done into fayth."

'John Knox. "It is yneucht that man invent a ceremonye, and then geve it a signification, according to his pleasur. For so mycht the ceremonyes of the Gentiles, and this day the ceremonyes of Mahomeit, be mantcand. But yf that anything proceed frome fayth, it man have the Word of God for the

assurance, for ye ar nott ignorant that 'fayth cumis by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God.' Now, yf ye will prove that your ceremonyes proceed from fayth, and do pleas God, ye man prove that God in expressed wordis hes commanded thame : or ellis shall ye never prove that they proceed from fayth, nor yitt that thei please God ; but that thei ar synne, and do displease him, according to the wordis of the Apostill, 'whatsoever is nott of fayth is synne.' "

'The Sub-Prior. "Will ye bynd us so strait, that we may do nothing without the express Word of God ? What ! And I ask a drink ? think ye that I synne ? and yitt I have not Goddis Word for one." This answer gave he, as mycht appear, to shift ower the argument upon the Freare, as that he did.

'John Knox. "I wald we should not jest in so grave a matter ; neither wold I that ye should begyn to illud the trewth with sophistrie ; and yf ye do, I will defend me the best that I can. And first to your drinking, I say, that yf ye eyther eat or drink without assurance of Goddis Worde, that in so doing ye displease God, and ye synne unto your very eatting and drynking. For sayis nott the Apostle, speaking evin of meatt and drynk, 'That the creatures ar sanctified unto man, evin by the Word and by prayer.' The Word is this : 'all thingis ar clean to the clean,' etc. Now, let me hear thus much of your ceremonyes, and I shall geve you the argument ; bot I wonder that ye compare thingis profane and holy thingis so indiscreatlie together. The questioun wes not, nor is it nott of meat or drynk, whairinto the Kingdom of God consistis nott ; but the questioun is of Goddis trew wirshipping, without the quhilk we can have no societie with God. And, here it is dowbited yf we may tack the same fredome in the using of Christis Sacramentis, that we may do in eatting and drynking. One meat I may eatt, another I may refuse, and that without scrupill of conscience. I may change ane with ane other, evin as oft as I please. Whether may we do the same in materis of religion ? May we cast away what we please, and receave what we please ? If I be weill remembered that Moses, in the name of God, sayis to the people of Israell, 'All that the Lord thy God commandis thee to do, that do thow to the Lord thy God ; add nothing to it ; dimynshe nothing from it.' Be this rewill, think I that the Kirk of Christ will measur Goddis religioun, and not by that which seames good in thare awin eis."

'The Sub-Prior. "Forgev me : I spak it but in mowes (jest),

and I was dry. And now, Father (said he to the Frear), follow the argument. Ye have heard what I have said, and what is answered unto me agane."

'Friar Arbuckle. "I shall prove plainlye, that Ceremonyes ar ordeaned by God."

John Knox. "Such as God hes ordayne we allow, and with reverence we use thame. But the questioun is of those that God hes nott ordayne, such as, in Baptisme, ar spattill, salt, candill, cuide (except it be to keep the barne from cald), hardis, oyle, and the rest of the Papisticall inventionis."

'Friar Arbuckle. "I will even prove these that ye dampne to be ordeyned of God."

'John Knox. "The pruiif I wald glaidly heir"' . . . and from this Friar John Knox did hear the extraordinary statement, which dismayed even the Friar's followers, "That the Apostles had not received the Holy Ghost when they wrote their Epistles, but after they received Him, and then they did order their ceremonies."—Knox's *History* (Laing's edition), vol. i. pp. 194-197.

#### NOTE 4

##### THE PROVINCIAL COUNCILS

When the bull of Pope Honorius III. arrived in Scotland, in 1225, instructing bishops and clergy of the Scottish Church to meet in Council under immediate Apostolic authority, the meeting of such a Council for the first time was a very notable event in Scottish history, for the schismatic Church of Celtic Scotia was recognised as having passed away, and the bull proclaimed *urbi et orbi* that a new nation had come into being in North Britain, and the Church established was henceforth to rank as substantially a distinct province of Catholic Christendom. In these later days, might not we see in its President the prototype, or authority, for our Moderator of General Assembly? The title was markedly non-hierarchical, and the President was chosen from among the members, held office only for one year or term—in sharp contrast to the rule of normal Provincial Councils—and was styled Conservator of the ordinances of the Council, which meant not the recorder or preserver of its decrees, but the person who was to see that the various decrees were duly executed by all and sundry. It may be stated that in the vernacular the Council was known as

*seinzie* or *senye*, a term which like the English word *seene* or *cene*, and the French *sesne* or *senne*, is a softened form not of *synodus* but *senatus*. While, however, the Conservator may suggest our Moderator, the Council must not be considered as an analogue of our General Assembly ; but from time to time, both the Council and the Assembly were engaged in conflict with the State. There was no precise relation defined between the spiritual and the civil court : sometimes the Council would seem to intrude on Parliament or the Estates, while, on the other hand, the secular authority seemed to intrude on the spiritual, and thus compromise spiritual independence and the rights of the Church. But of course things were curiously complicated then, for in the Estates of Parliament the prelates—bishops, abbots, priors—sometimes outnumbered the earls and lesser barons assembled there.

If the clergy in Winram's time attended the Council in the raiment originally prescribed, and observed the original forms, then the bishops entered the place of meeting 'arrayed in albs and amices, copes, solemn mitres (*i.e.* the grandest of a bishop's three mitres, jewelled and otherwise adorned), gloves, holding in their hands their pastoral staves ; abbots in surplices and copes, the mitred abbots in mitres ; deans and archdeacons in surplices, amices, and copes, and the other clergy in decorous and becoming raiment. Two candle-bearers, wearing albs and amices, with lighted candles, were to go before the deacon, who was to read the Gospel—"I am the good Shepherd"—and a sub-deacon was to accompany him. The deacon was to ask a blessing from the Conservator if present, but if absent from the senior bishop. When the Gospel had been read, the book was to be kisssd by the Conservator and each of the bishops. The Conservator was then to begin the hymn "Veni Creator," and at every verse the altar was to be censed by the bishops, and then the preacher was to deliver the sermon. After obtaining a blessing from the Conservator, he was to begin his sermon at the side of the altar.'

At one of the meetings of the Council which we know Winram attended and in which he took part (that of the year 1549), it is interesting to note, as we learn from the *Statuta*, that the Council 'assembled in the Holy Ghost, conformably with this precept of the Apostle (Acts xx., 28 Vulgate), for the glory of God to restore tranquillity and preserve complete unity in the ecclesiastical estate,' and consisted 'of the most reverend and

venerable fathers in Christ and lords, the ordinaries, prelates, and other distinguished and exalted churchmen and clergy underwritten [the entire list of members is given]. When they were duly assembled in the Church of the Friars-Preachers at Edinburgh, on the mandate of the most reverend lord archbishop primate and legatus natus, who presided, first of all high mass was sung for the outpouring of divine grace and for the happy furtherance and success of the business in the present Council or Synod; and when it was finished, the clergy going out with one accord, entered the hall or refectory of the said friars. There, when they had seated themselves in due order, and removed all who had no right to be present, an address was delivered to them by [a blank is here, no name given] a reverend and very learned licentiate in theology, and when that address or exhortation was ended there was read and re-read by the notary of the synod, word by word, in a distinct and loud voice,' what we would now call the minutes of the last meeting.

In the narrative preceding the *Statuta* of 1549, the reason is given why this Council in Edinburgh was summoned, namely, that in the main 'two causes and sorts of evils have stirred up among us great dissensions and occasions of heresies, to wit, the corruption of morals and profane lewdness of life in churchmen of almost all ranks, together with cras ignorance of literature and of all liberal arts—*bonarum literarum et artium omnium crassa inscitia*—and from these two sources principally spring many abuses, (to which) this holy synod and provincial council has determined to apply remedies, and put a check on these mischiefs.'

The *Statuta* of this Council are very valuable, for not only do they give an account of the pre-Reformation Church as regards its morals, but they supply us also with a picture, or series of pictures, of the clergy throughout the land, in their various vestments, some of them wearing beards and with no tonsure (both of which practices the Council condemned); some of them fasting, and some indifferent to fasting; and some reading the Scriptures when they sat down to meals that their 'souls be edified to good purpose and unprofitable tales debarred,' while others neglected such reading. We see also their servants and households, the cultivation of their glebes and churchlands, and the illegal granting of leases and feus of the same. There also come before us grammar-masters, lecturers, students, collectors of alms, parish clerks, testamentary executors, notaries, procurators, advocates, masters-of-works,



etc., and we notice references to many offices and usages no longer known to the Church, the Latin designations of which are quaint, curious, and interesting.

The *Statuta* of the Scottish Church were translated, with Introduction and Notes, by Dr David Patrick, under the auspices of the Scottish History Society, in 1907, and to this publication the author has to express his great indebtedness for the information given above as well as for many details scattered through this book. The full title of the publication is, *Statutes of the Scottish Church, 1225-1559, Being a Translation of Concilia Scotiæ : Ecclesiæ Scoticanæ Statuta Tam Provincilia Quam Synodalia Quæ Supersunt*. About half a century earlier there appeared the *Statuta Ecclesiæ Scoticanæ* or *Concilia Scotiæ*, edited by Dr Joseph Robertson, under the auspices of the Bannatyne Club, and in the two volumes which comprised the work were printed all the statutes of the provincial and diocesan councils known to have been preserved, nearly three hundred in number, together with a selection of relevant documents and formulas. Dr Robertson also added appendices, containing many other valuable documents bearing on ecclesiastical procedure and history.

## NOTE 5

### ST SERF

St Serf, or Servanus, was the reputed founder of the ancient monastery on the 'Inch of Lochleven.' He is understood to have lived in the earlier part of the sixth century, baptized and educated St Kentigern, and died at Culross. According to certain old documents contained in the Register of the Priory of St Andrews, Brude, son of Dergard, the last of the Pictish Kings, gave this island of Lochleven to God, St Serf, and the Culdees; and Macbeth, with his wife Gruoch (*Machbet filius Finlach . . . Gruoch filia Bodhe, rex et regina Scotorum*), bestowed Kirkness upon the Culdees of Loch Leven.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Knox's *History of the Reformation in Scotland*.  
 Buchanan's *Rerum Scoticarum Historia*.  
 Aikman's translation of *Buchanan's History*.  
 Calderwood's *History of the Kirk of Scotland*.  
 Pitscottie's *Chronicles*.  
*Booke of the Universall Kirk*.  
*Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*.  
 Mitchell's *Archbishop Hamilton's Catechism*.  
 Law's  
 Hay Fleming's "Register" of the Kirk-Session of St Andrews.  
     Scottish History Society.  
 Hannay's *Rentale Sancti Andree*. Scottish History Society.  
 Wodrow's *Collections*.  
 James Scott's *History of the Lives of Protestant Reformers in Scotland*.  
 M'Crie's *Life of John Knox*.  
 Hume Brown's *Knox*.  
 Hay Fleming's *Reformation in Scotland*.  
 Lee's *Lectures on the History of the Church of Scotland*.  
 Lorimer's *Scottish Reformation*.  
*National Dictionary of Biography*. Article 'John Winram.'  
 Hew Scott's *Fasti Ecclesiæ Scoticanæ*.  
*Satirical Poems of the Reformation*. Scottish Text Society.  
 Patrick's *Statutes*.  
*The College of St Leonard*, by John Herkless and Robert K. Hannay.  
*The Archbishops of St Andrews*, by John Herkless and Robert K. Hannay.  
*History of St Andrews*, by the Rev. C. J. Lyon, M.A.  
*Handbook of St Andrews and Neighbourhood*, by Dr Hay Fleming.  
 Pollen's *Papal Negotiations with Mary Queen of Scots*. Scottish History Society.  
*Acts of the Parliament of Scotland*.

## CHAPTER V

### JOHN ROW

IN the first General Assembly of the Scottish Church there sat a member, John Row, whose life-story was no ordinary one. At the time he was about thirty-five years of age, and was a great authority on canon law, while his knowledge of languages, ancient and modern, was exceptional. He had represented the Scottish clergy at the Vatican, had been marked out for favour by two Popes, and for a while was Papal Nuncio. It was about a year before the meeting of this General Assembly that he became attracted to the Reformed Church, and the influences which led to such a great and sudden change in his opinions and in his career we shall at once state. There was a chapel dedicated to our Lady of Loretto, near Musselburgh, which had a great sanctity. Thomas the Hermit <sup>1</sup> had lived there, and he had brought to it an image of the Virgin from Loretto in Italy. For many years this anchorite had dispensed pardons and indulgences at the shrine :

— ‘ Hermit of Laureit  
He put the common pepill in belief  
That blynd gat sicht and cruikit gat their feit.’

Pilgrims were wont to kiss ‘ the clagged tail,’ or soiled border, of his garment. James V., having been driven back by tempestuous weather, while on a voyage to

<sup>1</sup> See Note 1.

France previous to his first marriage, made a pilgrimage on foot from Stirling to this shrine. It was a great resort for devotional and other purposes. Sir David Lyndsay says—

‘ I have sene ane marvellous multitude,  
Young men and women flingand on their feit  
Under the forme of feinzeit sanctitude,  
Fortill adore ane image in Laureit.’

In the year 1559 the friars announced that a great miracle was to be performed at this place, which would afford unmistakable proof that theirs was the true faith. They would restore sight to a young man who had been born blind. On the day appointed a great crowd assembled to see this done. The youth was placed on a platform erected outside the chapel, and a large number of monks and priests stood around. No one seemed to doubt the man's blindness, for, sightless, he had often been seen wandering about, seeking charity. After an elaborate religious service, the Virgin of Loretto, along with many saints, was invoked to cure the poor sufferer, and soon, to the astonishment of all, the man opened his eyes. After thanking the friars, and the Virgin and the saints, for the wonderful cure wrought on him, he descended from the platform and moved among the people that all might see how genuine the miracle was, and that he might receive alms from the astonished multitude.

But it was all an imposture. One in that crowd, Robert Colville of Cleish, had his suspicions of the whole affair, and also of the other so-called cures formerly effected at Loretto. Determined to sift the matter to the bottom, Colville, after some talk with the young man, and giving him a piece of money, persuaded him to come with him to his house in Edinburgh. Arrived there he took the lad into a private room, locked the door,

told him plainly that he believed the whole thing was a fraud, and waited for an explanation. Then the true tale was told. When a boy he had been employed by the nuns of the Sciennes (*i.e.* of Siena) in the neighbourhood of Edinburgh to tend their cattle on the slopes of Arthur Seat, and they had noticed a peculiar faculty he had of turning up the whites of his eyes as blind men do, and keeping them so for a long time. Some friars came to know of this, and saw the use they could make of it for their own purposes. Accordingly, with the connivance of the nuns, they kept him a long time from his associates, and then sent him out to beg as a blind pauper, at the same time extracting from him a solemn vow never to reveal the secret. The lad now, on Colville's demand, 'played the pavier' by 'flypping up the lid of his eyes and casting up the white,' so as to appear as he was on the platform at Loretto before the religious ceremonies began.

Squire Meldrum (for such, from his romantic history, was Colville usually called, in allusion to a person of that name who had been celebrated by Sir David Lyndsay) then told the young man that he had behaved most wickedly, and insisted that the next day he must publicly repeat the whole story at the Cross of Edinburgh. The lad said he was afraid to do so, as it would expose him to the vengeance of the friars, but the Squire said he would appoint him his servant and protect him. Accordingly this was done, and, with drawn sword, Colville stood beside him at the Cross as he rehearsed the tale. When the confession was finished, his protector placed him on the same horse as himself, and carried him safely to his house in Fife. All the country came to hear of the imposture, and the old faith suffered much because of it.

It made a deep impression on John Row. He heard the whole story at first hand from Colville himself, at



whose house he was visiting, and, in the words of his son, 'being amazed, and withall ingenuous, would not, yea, durst not, shoote (shut) out the light holden out to him, considering the knaverie of the Kirkmen in the pretendit miracle, and withall reading and considering 2 Thessalonians ii., it pleased the Lord to convert him from Popery to the Reformed Religion.' Row afterwards went to hear Knox preach, had conversations with him, as also with Christopher Goodman and others of the reformers, and then made formal abjuration of Popery. Says his grandson: '*Ipse nuncius, nassa evangelii irretitus, ejus pura, pia, pathetica prædicatione inescatus, pontificiis syrtibus, famigerati Knoxi opera, extractus est.*' 'This same nuncio, caught in the Gospel net, by the travail of the famous Knox, with his pure, godly, moving preaching allured, was delivered from the miry clay of the papacy.'

John Row was born in the year 1525, in the neighbourhood of Stirling—'in a landward rume called Row,' says his son, 'betwixt Stirline and Dumblane.' Row was a small property—probably a farm—which, his son informs us, belonged to the family. He was educated at the Grammar School of Stirling, and then proceeded to the University of St Andrews. The name Johannes Rove, *Loudon* (i.e. Lothian, embracing then a great part of the south of Scotland), occurs in the records of that University among those who matriculated at St Leonard's College in the year 1544. When he had completed his philosophical course he took the degree of M.A., and then devoted himself to the study of civil and canon law. Becoming a skilful pleader in the Consistory Court of St Andrews—'whilk in those days was of great resort and renowne'—he was held in such regard by his clerical brethren for his theoretical and practical knowledge of law, that in the year 1550

they nominated him as their agent for managing their affairs at the Court of Rome. Row accordingly proceeded to Italy, and remained in that country for about eight years. An 'aspiring spirit,' says his son, also prompted him to go abroad. The Pope in the year 1556, seems to have confirmed his appointment as Scottish agent, or reappointed him. It may here be stated that there were several divines in the Reformed Church who were intimately acquainted with the principles of jurisprudence, and who were qualified by the course of study they had pursued to give their advice on questions relating to government and the administration of laws. This may be explained partly by the attraction of the new learning, which embraced knowledge of all subjects, partly as a recoil from the dry and repellent logic of scholasticism, and partly also from the feeling which had now arisen that it was the duty of all subjects or citizens to promote the public good. The canon law which churchmen had then to study was an extremely characteristic product of the Middle Ages, and related to such subjects as validity of marriage, prohibited degrees of affinity and consanguinity, divorce and excommunication; while the civil law, on the other hand, was connected with the jurisprudence of ancient Rome, and dealt mainly with such subjects as purchase and sale, mortgages, loans, servitudes and prescription.

We have considerable information as to Row's employment in Rome from a curious and valuable set of papers<sup>1</sup> which have come down to these days, and which, besides containing papal bulls relating to bishoprics and benefices in Scotland, have a number of letters that passed between the Scottish primate and the Roman Court, together with accounts of receipts and

<sup>1</sup> According to Dr Thomas M'Crie they were, when his *Life of John Knox* was published, 'in the possession of Thomas Thomson, Esq.'

disbursements by the agent at Rome for the Earl of Arran, Regent of the Kingdom, and others. John Row was employed as their procurator, and it is interesting to find such items as the following. In 'Ane Recollection of my lord of Sanct Andros missives to my lord of Kilwinning,' it is stated that it was a matter of 'content M. Johne Row was put in charge of his (lordship's) affairs in Rome XI Martii 1554.' In 'Ane Memoir of all things left w<sup>t</sup> M. Johne Row, be Gavin, commendator of Kilwinning, at his departing of Rome, 20 Mēsis Martii 1555' is the following, 'Item, appointed w<sup>t</sup> M. Johne Row for the provestrie of Kirkfield, and caus M. Alex<sup>r</sup>. Forres send his mandat to ratify the XX<sup>u</sup> pension reservit to the said M. Jhone.' In a variety of letters to the Pope, 'concerning my lord duckis bairnis, my lord archbishops of Sanct Andros, bischope Argile, my lord Kilwinning self and utheris their frends,' to Cardinal Sermoneta 'regni Scotiæ promotori,' and to other members of the Sacred College, from John Archbishop of St Andrews, Gavin, co-adjutor to the Archbishop, James, Earl of Arran, and Mary, dowager Queen and Regent of the Kingdom, written during the years 1555 and 1556, and inserted in the same manuscript, John Row is recognised and recommended as procurator for the See of St Andrews. It is interesting to observe that cipher was used in this correspondence, for the book closes with a table of ciphers and their explanations, and the title given is 'Ciphre sent be my L[ord] of Sanct Andros of Edin<sup>r</sup>. XIIj May 1555, to M. Johne Row in Rome.'

It appears that one of the chief purposes of Row's remaining in the Eternal City was to obtain confirmation and extension of the powers formerly granted to the Archbishop of St Andrews as primate and *legatus natus* of Scotland, from which Gavin Dunbar, late Arch-

bishop of Glasgow, had procured an 'exemption. In support of his claim, the primate urged that 'there had always been a great number of heretics in the diocese of Glasgow,' that being near England there was 'easy ingress and egress to persons of bad manners and opinions,' that terrible things had happened such as 'the burning of the images of God and the saints, the contempt of prelates, the beating of priests and monks, and eating of forbidden meats.' The primate felt that the existing arrangement not only prevented him making an effort to suppress such scandals, but hindered also the Archbishop of Glasgow in his efforts to keep his diocese free from such evils. As to how the matter was settled, we have no information from these papers.

Row was held in esteem by the authorities in Rome. Cardinal Sforza drew to him, and proved a good friend. Our Scotsman, moreover, was in favour with Pope Julius III., and afterwards with Pope Paul IV. We find that on the 20th February 1556 he received the degree of Licentiate of Laws from the University of Rome—*Insignitus fuit gradu Licentiatuæ in utroque Jure, coram collegio Advocatorum Universitatis almæ Urbis*. The higher degree of Doctor of Laws was conferred upon him by the University of Padua. During his residence in Italy he made a special study of the Greek and Hebrew languages, and became proficient in them. Archbishop Spottiswood says that, had it not been for a serious breakdown in his health Row would have attained to great preferment. The Pope was so concerned about his illness that he sent his own physicians to attend the sufferer, but the advice they gave was that, a change of air being desirable, he should return to his native land. It was accordingly arranged that Row should go back to Scotland, and the Pontiff, having heard that the reformed doctrines were making

progress there, invested him with official authority to investigate the causes and devise means for preventing the further progress of the new heresy. It was as Papal Nuncio,<sup>1</sup> or Legate, therefore that he returned to his native land.

The *Coronis* (a supplement to Row's *History of the Kirk*) says that 'upon the 29th September 1558 he landed at Haymouth,' that is Eyemouth, on the coast of Berwickshire. But, as we have seen, instead of him converting the reformers, the reformers converted him. He proved a 'corbie messenger,' writes his grandson, or, as he Latinises it, a *corvus legatus*; for, as with the raven and the ark of Noah, he never returned to Rome. There must, however, be some mistake here, or the date of his arrival in Scotland is wrongly given, for there is extant a letter from John Row, dated Rome, May 1559. This we now give, as not only is it possibly the sole document of his which has come down to us, but in its quaint spelling and pronunciation it is as a voice from a remote past. The person to whom it is addressed is Donald Campbell, Abbot of Cupar, who was elected Bishop of Brechin, and who was anxious that the Court of Rome should confirm his appointment—which, however, was not done. Campbell accordingly never assumed the title of Bishop of Brechin, but still sat in Parliament among the Lords Spiritual as Abbot of Cupar. He died in 1562. Here is the letter:—

'MY LORD,—Efter humble commendatioun off service, 17 Apryl, resautt youre Lordship's wrytting be Flanderis, off Edinburgh vj Februarij, and thereafter ane uder zoure Lordschip's wrytting be France to the samyn effect, togidder with ane Memoriall toward the provisioun off the Bishopric of Brechine, desyrand me to

<sup>1</sup> This may not have been precisely as that office is understood now, but Row is so designated by his son and others.



concurr heirin wyth Mr James Thorntoun<sup>1</sup>; conforme als to the quhilk I resaut ane wrytting fra my lord provest of Sanctandrois, my maister, to employing wter diligence and labors heyranent. Towart the quhilk besines, your Lordschip pleis vnderstand, Mr James Thorntoun and I presentit our Quenis Grace supplication to our Promotoure, quha thocht the mater wynderous difficulte to be obtenit be the ressoun off thir impediments; the first because the Pope [Paul IV.] will geve nay retentione *in commendam* off monasteries that ar brukit *in titulum*; the second wes towart the changeing off zoure Lordship's habitt; towart the quhilk pwints, we have informit syndry Cardinallis, off quhilk we find sum condescendent to our intent, quaharthrow we ar not alleterly not off esperans, and sall not faill to caus the Promotoure speyk the Pape heyranent, be the first commodite; for trewly the Cardinallis ar in gret difficulte to get audience off the Pape, and he makkis warray few consistors. Elwais extreme diligence sal be done, to the effect zour Lordship may obtaine zour intent heyrin, or thane the Papis absolutt will sall impresshe the samyn; for I believe thair sall not be maid gret difficulte towart zour habitt, sua the remanent could be obtenit. Attour the banchors commissioun send heir towart the moving for thes expedition, commandis to deliver the moving<sup>2</sup> quaharone the bulls ar sped, the quhilk commissioun wald be reformit, causand the banchors heir oblis thame in euerting expenses, and to deburce the remanent for the speding off the bullis; for it is our gret ane sowme to tak heir on creditt, and thereafter to seyk the samyn agane at the banchors, quhane the expeditioun is endit. Towart this and all uther thingis, becaus Mr James Thorntoun

<sup>1</sup> See Note 2.

<sup>2</sup> A moving is what would now be called a motion before the court.

wryttis to zour Lordship at lenthe, I will not fasche zow wyth langar wrytting, assurand zour Lordship may command me wyth all thing that lyis in my power. As to the expensis off the expeditioun in case the samyn be grantit, Mr James hes causit mak the compt thair of, quhilk he sends instantly to zour Lordship, quhome eternall God preserve eternally. Romæ, XI Maij 1559,

Zour Lordship's serviteure,

JOANNES ROW.'

Addressed—

'To my LORD OF COWPER,

my speciall Lord and Maister,

SCONE.'

Whatever may have been the precise date of Row's final return to Scotland, it seems certain that it was the Lord James Stewart who, admiring his learning and character, persuaded him to remain in his native country and be of service to the cause of religion there; and he became an earnest, useful, and trusted leader of the Protestant Church.

When the Reformation was established, Row became for a short time minister of Kennoway (not Kilconquhar, as is sometimes stated), in Fife, and there he married Margaret Bethune, daughter of John Bethune, or Beaton, of Balfour. As this laird of Balfour was the nephew of Cardinal Beaton, it is somewhat singular that the doughty Protestant John Row should have as his wife the grandniece of so staunch a Romanist as the well-known Cardinal. The lands of Kennoway were 'ane barronie of land pertaining to the laird of Balfour.'

Row also held the vicarage of Kennoway, but demitted it some time before January 23rd, 1573. In July 1560 he was appointed to the old, now Middle, Church of Perth, which incumbency he held till his death. In the quaint wording of these days : ' The commissionaris of Bruchis, with some of the Nobilitie and Barronis, were appoyntit to see the equal distribution of ministeris, to change and transport as the maist pairt sould think expedient, and sua was . . . Maister Johnne Row to Sanct Johnstoun [Perth]. ' Perhaps one of the reasons for Row's being sent to Perth was that he might use his gifts of scholarship in the way of imparting instruction to young men, for the reformers found it necessary to settle scholarly men in towns which were not seats of a University. In point of fact this minister did teach Greek and also Hebrew—a language almost entirely unknown then in Scotland. Row indeed was the first to teach it. The Grammar School at Perth had great fame, and county gentlemen were in the habit of sending their sons to it for their education. Many of these were boarded with Row, where they were taught various languages. Latin was spoken by the boys in the school and in the playing-fields, and nothing but French was spoken in the minister's house. The Holy Scriptures were read before and after meals, and that in the original tongues. Row's son, John, as a mere child, came to know the Hebrew characters before he knew his English letters, and at eight years of age was able to read a Hebrew passage of Scripture with the family. It is therefore not to be wondered at that, when this young man entered Edinburgh University, shortly after its erection, his unusual acquaintance with that language attracted the attention of Principal Rollock. The minister of Perth was also the means of having Greek taught in the Grammar School there, for

he gave its master lessons in that tongue, who again was soon able to teach it to his scholars. Dr Thomas M'Crie, in his *Life of John Knox*, puts it well when he says: 'Some of our Scottish literati, who entertain such a diminutive idea of the taste and learning of those times, might have been taken by surprise had they been set down at the table of one of the Scottish Reformers, surrounded with a circle of his children and pupils, when the conversation was all carried on in French, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. Such, however, was the common practice in the house of John Row.' Robert Colville of Cleish called him 'a great clergyman, a great linguist, and a great lawyer.'

Perhaps a word may be said here about the humanity, or geniality, of the Scottish reformers. They were not so stern, so narrow, so opposed to amusements and pastimes as many have supposed. Professor Aytoun quotes an Act of Parliament, as instigated by Knox and his fellow-reformers, forbidding the celebration of Robin Hood and Little John, the Abbot of Unreason, and the Queen of May, and says that under such rulers

' 'Twas sin to smile, 'twas sin to laugh,  
'Twas sin to sport or play.'

Not only are such lines untrue, but the Act referred to was passed in pre-Reformation days, when Knox had no influence whatever on the legislation of the country. Knox himself, as we have seen, had a right merry laugh and, to come to the concrete, did not condemn dancing as such, but only when its conditions and surroundings and purposes were unseemly.<sup>1</sup> He himself occasionally indulged in 'recreation and pastyme by exercise of the body.' Did he not play at bowls? As Hill Burton has pointed out, dancing was by no means decorous in

<sup>1</sup> See p. 68.

Knox's time, as the books of Brantôme and Margaret of Navarre sufficiently indicate. Tripping 'on the light fantastic toe' had, at that time, a meaning, in many cases, beyond the mere graceful cadenced exercise. James Melville, who as a boy boarded at a manse, tells us in his *Diary* that he not only learned Latin and French there, but also archery, golf, fencing, running, leaping, swimming, and wrestling. Moreover, when he was a student at St Andrews with the reformed teaching prevailing there, he was taught music, instrumental and vocal, for which he had a great liking. Two or three of his fellow-students were also musically inclined, one of them playing on the 'virginals,' another on the 'lute and githorn,' while the regent himself was devoted to the 'pinalds.' Later, when Melville was a student at Glasgow University, he used to visit at the house of a citizen, who was in the habit of entertaining, as his guests, proficients in singing and playing on instruments. His own father-in-law—John Durie, minister of Leith—was an enthusiastic volunteer. 'Na sooner was the gown af,' says Melville, 'and Byble out of hand fra the Kirk, when on ged the corslet, and fangit was the hagbot, and to the fields.'

To return to Row and his Semitic studies. Until Andrew Bruce Davidson was appointed to the Chair of Hebrew and Oriental Languages in New College, Edinburgh, there had been practically no progress, and no literary output, in Scotland, as regards that department of human learning, unless we except what was done by that prodigy of linguistic attainment, at the beginning of last century, Professor Murray of Edinburgh University, whose promise was so great, but whose career, alas! was so brief. Nor is it to be forgotten that Boston of Ettrick was a diligent student of Hebrew—with fanciful theories on that language's accentuation—



and after his death there was published at Amsterdam his *Tractatus Stigmologicus*, with no influence, however, on Semitic scholarship. Professor Davidson, in one of his early lectures, lamented Scotland's poverty in this connection for the last three centuries or so, and said that, while our country could claim Latinists, Grecians, philosophers, and scientific experts, she had no oriental scholar. It was otherwise, he went on to say, in the sixteenth century, and he told the story of a scholar at that time who, on being challenged by the nobles to produce his commission to preach, unstrung his Hebrew Bible from his belt, and threw it down among them, telling them that his commission to preach lay there—they might read it if they chose. The Professor did not mention the name of the brave scholar, but it appears to have been Andrew Melville. The year would be 1584, but nearly a quarter of a century earlier John Row could have given the same challenge.

It has been said that the effects of the Scottish Reformation on literature were disastrous. For instance, in Mr T. F. Henderson's *Scottish Vernacular Literature, a Succinct History*, we have the following: 'Secular poetry came under its peculiar ban, and indeed almost every form of secular literature—literature underived from or uninterlarded with Scripture—as essentially mundane and frivolous, and therefore sinful.' As a matter of fact the General Assembly, in March 1574-5, did take up the matter of plays, tragedies, and comedies, and strongly condemned the acting of any such as were founded on Scripture, but others not thus founded were to be looked into before they were 'proponit publicklye,' and they were not to be acted on Sundays. This is surely different from banning practically all secular literature.

It may be mentioned here that, as we learn from the

*Register of Ministers*, John Row's stipend as minister of Perth was '200 pounds, with the Kirk land, and ane chalder of quhite aittis.' He is said to have been an eloquent preacher, and, because of his mildness of temper and polished manners—resulting from his long residence abroad—he was highly acceptable to persons of all ranks. We know that he published at least one book, for in the testament of Thomas Bassinden, printer in Edinburgh, who died on the 18th October 1577, which testament contains an inventory of his goods, there occurs the following sentence, 'Item, ane M. Johne Rowis Signes of the Sacramentis, price xijd.' But we have no further information anywhere about this or any other work.

In the city of Perth there is an institution which has conferred, and still confers, much benefit on poor people. This is King James VIth's Hospital, and with its founding and early success John Row evidently had a good deal to do. It was on the 9th August 1569 that there was sent, to Master Row and the lay-elders of Perth, the foundation charter of the Hospital, from the Earl of Moray, regent for the infant-king. The funds allotted were derived from the revenues and emoluments which had belonged to the monasteries, chapels, and altars of the Romish Church in Perth, and also any sums payable by the city and neighbourhood to other religious houses in the kingdom. The application of these funds was now to be for the 'sustenance and hospitality of the poor members of Jesus Christ residing and abiding in the burgh of Perth, and to other pious and divine uses.' The manner in which the Hospital was to be governed showed the confidence which the Regent placed in Row, for the minister and elders were to be the sole managers, and were to enjoy in their meetings the powers and privileges of a civil court. The ancient records of this

institution show that the Rev. John Row and his elders were determined and untiring in their efforts, in spite of much opposition, to gain possession for the poor of the revenues allotted. It is to be observed, however, that they treated in a generous spirit any of the monks, friars, and chaplains still living, whom the Reformation had deprived of their means of livelihood. They granted to them annual pensions. And so it was throughout Scotland, as has already been referred to in a previous chapter. When the monastic buildings were demolished their inmates were not reduced to utter poverty, but had yearly allowances granted to them, which were called 'friars' pensions.' Nor should it be forgotten that the bishops and other prelates of the Romish Church were allowed to possess for life two-thirds of their revenues, the Reformed Church receiving for her maintenance the remaining one-third, or what portion thereof the Crown gave.

In the affairs of the Church our Reformer took an interested and important part. As already stated he was a member of the first General Assembly; and in the course of the years that followed he was four times its moderator. He was one of the six Johns who drew up the *Confession of Faith* and the *First Book of Discipline*. He had also a part in framing the *Second Book of Discipline*, for in the year 1574 he was appointed one of the Commissioners to 'convene and write the articles which concern the jurisdiction of the Kirk,' and in the following year was one of those chosen with the Commissioners that might be appointed by the Regent 'upon the jurisdiction and policy of the Kirk.' The result of these and other Commissions, of which Row continued to be a member, was the construction of the *Second Book of Discipline*. About this time we find him on a committee appointed to take steps that

the gift of the third of the benefices, which Queen Mary had promised, 'might be despatched through the seals.' Shortly after he subscribes the letter which was sent to the bishops of England regarding the wearing of the surplice. This letter, or address, was also signed by John Winram, among others, and it was Knox who composed it. We give the letter—summarised and modernised—from which it will be observed that the leaders of the Scottish Church took a wide, charitable, and common-sense view of the matter. Had it been attended to by the leaders of the English Church much trouble and sore disaster in later days would have been avoided. Carlyle, in his *Oliver Cromwell*, deals in a trenchantly sarcastic vein with the 'dignified ceremonialism,' 'mimetic dramaturgy,' 'respectable church-tippets'—he lingers humorously over the 'four surplices at Allhallowtide'—of James I. and Charles I. with their ecclesiastical 'fugleman policy,' and their 'pulling one way and England and the Eternal Laws pulling another, the rent fast widening till no man can heal it.' The letter, signed by John Row, shows the better way, and also shows that, in this matter at least, the Church of Scotland was more advanced in toleration than the Church of England. The Church of Scotland never made the Geneva gown an essential of worship or ceremonial rite, whereas the Church of England did so with the surplice, losing thereby thousands of their godly ministers and members—'cast out of their parishes,' says Carlyle, 'for genuflexions, white surplices, and such like'; and as said His Majesty King James VI., 'if they will not conform I will harry them out of the country.' They did not conform, and the royal word was kept, to the injury of England and the ultimate ruin of the house of Stuart.

Before we give the letter, it may be stated that Row

appears to have been looked upon as an authority on vestments and such like, doubtless because of his knowledge of canon law and church usages. The General Assembly appointed him along with others 'to revise and consider Mr William Ramsey's answer to Bullinger's book *On the Habits of Preachers*.' The letter, which does not appear in Knox's History, is inserted by Keith in his, and is as follows : 'The Superintendents, ministers, and commissioners of Kirks within the realm of Scotland, unto their brethren, the bishops and pastors of England, who have renounced the Roman antichrist, and are professing with them the Lord Jesus in sincerity, wish the perpetual increase of the Holy Spirit. Reverend pastors, it has come to our knowledge, both by word and writ, that divers of our dear brethren, among whom are some of the best learned men in your realm, have been deprived of their ecclesiastical function, and forbidden by you to preach, because their consciences will not suffer them to take upon them such garments as were used in the time of blindness and idolatry. We will not enter into the argument, which we understand is, with greater vehemence than is necessary, agitated with you, whether such apparel is to be accounted among the things which are simple and indifferent ; but, in the bowels of Christ Jesus, we crave that Christian charity may so far prevail in you, that ye would not do unto others what ye would not wish that others should do unto you. You cannot be ignorant how tender a thing the conscience of man is. All that have knowledge are not alike persuaded. Your conscience reclaims not at the using of such garments ; but many thousands of godly and learned men are of another mind ; they cannot consent to the surplice, the corner cap, and tippet, for these things were formerly the badges of idolatry. Our brethren, who conscientiously



reject that unprofitable apparel, do neither damn nor molest you who use such trifles. If ye shall do like to them, we doubt not but therein ye shall please God, and comfort the hearts of many, who are wounded with your severity to our godly and beloved brethren. We look that you will not refuse the humble request of us your brethren, in whom albeit there appears no great worldly pomp; yet we suppose, that ye will not so far despise us, as not to esteem us in the numbers of them who fight against the Roman antichrist, and travail that the Kingdom of Jesus Christ may be universally promoted. To the protection of the Lord Jesus we heartily commit you. From Edinburgh out of our General Assembly, and third session thereof, December 27th, 1566: From your loving brethren and fellow-preachers in Christ Jesus. Amen.' As in these studies we have found, and shall find, the Reformed Church of Scotland having dealings with the Reformed Church of England, it should be noted that these two Churches were in much closer relationship in the second half of the sixteenth century than they were in later days. Knox himself had no small part in moulding the character of the English Church, and Willock, as we have seen, held orders simultaneously in both Churches. There was indeed no hard and fast line between Presbytery and Episcopacy in those times. Lord Macaulay points out, in his History, that as late as the year 1603, the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury solemnly recognised the Church of Scotland as a branch of the Holy Catholic Church of Christ, and that Presbyterian ministers were entitled to place and voice in Œcumenical Councils. He also says that many English benefices were held by divines who had been admitted to the ministry in the Calvinistic form used on the Continent, and that re-ordination by a bishop in such cases was

not thought necessary or even lawful. Hooker, he adds, held Calvin in great esteem, and eulogised him, declaring that he was a man to whom thousands were indebted for the knowledge of divine truth, but who was himself indebted to God alone.

On 25th June 1566 an important Assembly was held, of which George Buchanan was Moderator, and which played a notable part in the affairs of the nation at that time. There was cleavage in the ranks of the nobility, a state of matters which had been ever recurring since Queen Mary returned from France. The Earl of Glencairn, with a band of his followers, had gone to the Chapel of Holyrood and broken in pieces the altars and statues there, a proceeding which had incensed the Queen's party, and especially the Hamiltons, who happened at that time to have many of their supporters in the city. The result was that no agreement could be come to among the nobles for the redressing of disorders in the Church and in the State. Civil war seemed imminent. Help was asked from the General Assembly, and letters were sent from it to several of the lords. Commissioners were also appointed by it, among whom was John Row, to meet with the lords who 'either were actually declared for the Hamiltons or were neuter,' to get them all to come together and take steps for the better ordering of the affairs of the Church. This action of the Assembly greatly pleased many of the nobles, who profusely promised to do what was desired, but, as Knox remarks, 'how they performed their promises, God knows.'

In July 1568 Row was appointed by the Assembly to visit Galloway, the Bishop there being under censure, and in March 1570 we find him styled Commissioner of Galloway, though his son styles him Superintendent of that province. With regard to this there is a curious

passage in Row's *History of the Kirk of Scotland*, which has reference to a period some forty years later, when a certain Mr Cowper was created Bishop of Galloway. 'His best apologie,' says the History, was that 'he had gotten more light than he had before. One answered merrilie, It is true, for now he has upon his table two great candles, whereas before he had but one small candle; other more light I know none. He was also accustomed to say, he had but succeeded Mr John Row, minister of Perth, and bishop of Galloway. It is true Mr John Row was minister of Saint Johnstoune [Perth], and Superintendent of Galloway, but the difference between the Superintendents and diocesan lordlie Prelats was vast and many, for Superintendents (I confess the words in effect are *synonyma*, seeing that *episcopoeisthai* is *superintendere*) were acknowledged to be necessarie and useful in the infancie of our Kirk, before presbyteries could be had for the planting of Kirks, and thus the Apostle employed Timothie, Titus, and others. The Superintendents were pastors over a particular flock, an employment too base for my Lord Bishop. The Superintendents received their commission, were countable to, and were censurate by, the General Assemblie. The Superintendents did, with difficulty and much urging, embrace the office, wherein was to be seen nothing but *onus* not *honos*, povertie and pains, no preferment and riches, and therefore when they were requyred to lay that employment aside, they quat it gladly and cheerfully.'

When the petition of the Church, in reference to benefices, was rejected by the Parliament of the King's party held at Stirling in August 1571, we find Row preaching on the Sunday following in that town, and denouncing from the pulpit 'judgments against the lords for their covetousness.' This man, usually so

mild in manners and speech spoke indignantly thus: 'I care not, my lords, if you will be displeased, for I speak my conscience before God, who will not suffer such wickedness and contempt to go unpunished.'

At the Assembly convened at Edinburgh on 6th March 1573, a complaint was made against the minister of Perth for having a plurality of benefices. The minister admitted that he had two vicarages—Twynam and Terregles in the Stewartry of Kirkcudbright—but maintained that they were of little or no profit to him; as for the 'commissionary of Galloway' he would only be too glad to be disburthened of it. But there was another charge laid against him at this Assembly of which we must make mention, as it throws some curious light on those times. The charge or complaint was that he had solemnised a marriage between the Master of Crawford (afterwards ninth Earl of Crawford) and Lillas, a daughter of Lord Drummond, and cousin of Lord Ruthven, and that no banns had been proclaimed, nor (though the marriage ceremony had taken place in the church on Thursday at the evening prayers) had the law then existing been observed that the marriage must be 'on the Sabbath forenoon, in the face of the congregation.' An irregularity such as that, committed by a man of Row's standing, created much talk, and the Assembly had to take cognisance of it. Row pleaded that what he had done was by command of the Kirk-Session of which William, Lord Ruthven, provost of the town, was a member, and that he was present at the time. The Assembly, however, would not sustain the plea and 'ordained that the Act made against ministers solemnising the marriage of other parishioners, or without proclamation of banns, should have strength against John Row, and that he should underly censure during the Church's will.' The minister

of Perth, however, could not have remained very long under censure—a day perhaps, or only a few hours—for in that same Assembly he seems to have been actively engaged thereafter in the business that came before it. The impression probably was that Lord Ruthven, afterwards Earl of Gowrie—he was the main instigator of the Ruthven Raid, and father of the Earl who was identified with the Gowrie Conspiracy—was most to blame in the matter, but he was a man held in much respect by the Perth people, and was an ardent supporter of the Reformed Church. It may be remarked, says an old minister—James Scott of Perth—on the whole incident, ‘how very ungenerous it is, when persons of a superior station, as Lord Ruthven was, take it upon them to importune ministers, in extraordinary cases, to do anything which ministers in any degree reckon to be irregular.’ But ministers, however excellent, should not allow themselves to be browbeaten or cajoled into doing what is wrong—even though it be only ecclesiastical and not moral law that is broken. It seems rather curious that the rule then was that marriages, as well as baptisms, be celebrated on Sundays—‘the parties [to] assemble at the beginning of the sermon’—all such celebrated otherwise as on ‘ferial’ or ordinary week-days, being deemed irregular and dealt with as such. The proper time for baptism comes up before the Assembly in an odd manner, for in a set of perplexing questions to be solved by that body, we have this—‘What punishment shall be for ane minister that baptises ane murtherer’s bairn on ane Monday, not being ane day of preaching, and without repentance of the murtherer remaining at the King’s horn?’—that is, a fugitive from justice. The answer is, ‘Deservet deposition’ (*Book of Universal Kirk*, i. 345).



John Row was more than once in the royal presence. In connection with the difficult matter of the provision of stipends for the ministers, Knox tells us that after the Assembly which met in December 1566, 'the Bishop of Galloway, with the Superintendent of Lothian and Mr Johne Row, passing to Stirling, obtained their demands in an ample manner at the Queen's Majestie's hand according to their desire, and likewise they obtained for every borough a gift or donation of the altarages, annuals, and obites, which before were given to the papists, now to be disposed for the maintenance of the ministers and schools within the boroughs, and the rest to the poor or hospital.' Knox further informs us that Row and his fellow-commissioners 'easily obtained audience of the King and Queen [*i.e.* of Darnley and Mary], and, after reverence done, Mr John Row, in name of the rest, opened the matter, lamenting and bewailing the miserable state of the poor ministers.' He also adverted to the change which the Reformers desired the Queen to make of her religion, and then presented the written address, which, reflecting Row's temper and style of writing, was singularly moderate and courteous in tone. It appears that the next year our reformer had another interview with Queen Mary, when further emoluments were obtained for the Protestant clergy. It may be added here that Row was appointed one of a committee of ministers to hold a conference with the lords as to the advisability of ministers moderating their language in their references to the Queen in their prayers and sermons; but nothing resulted from the conference. Still earlier, when 'the Devill, finding his rainzeis lowse, ran fordwarte in his course, and the Queen took upon her gretter baldness than sche and Baales' bleating preastis durst have attempted befoir,' and the Mass was celebrated

with 'all myscheivous solempnitie,' a meeting was 'upon this questioun conveyned in the house of Mr James Makgill, the Lord James, the Erle of Mortoun, the Erle Merschell, Secretarie Lethingtoun, the Justice Cleark, and Cleark Registre, who all reassoned for the part of the Queen affirmyng, "That the subjects mycht not lauchfullie tak the Messe from hir"; in the contrair judgement war the principal ministeris, Mr Johne Row, Maister George Hay, Maister Robert Hammyltoun, and Johne Knox' (Knox's *History*, vol. ii. p. 291).

Row seems for a time to have been favourable to a form of prelacy, for in the General Assembly which met in August 1575, when the question was raised 'whether bishops as now allowed in Scotland had their functions from the Word of God,' he was chosen with three others to argue in favour of Episcopacy. Andrew Melville made a notable, indeed historical, speech on this occasion, which greatly impressed the Assembly, and the debate was a lengthened one. The result was that not only were diocesan bishops disapproved of, but without one contradictory or dissenting voice the abolition of Episcopacy was resolved on. The sequel as regards John Row, we give in the words of his son: 'At first he thought the Prelatical government might well enough stand with Protestant doctrine; and monarchie being the best government in the state he thought it looked likest to that in the Kirk to be ruled by a prelat; and being one of them that was for the affirmative, that bishops were lawful, after long disputation and examination of that poynt, he and all they who took part of the argument yielded, were forced, by strength of reason and light holden out from Scripture, to confess their errour; and after that he (and all the rest) preached down prelacie all his days.'

It is somewhat singular that in the Register of the

Privy Council, with reference to an incident that occurred in 1574, we find John Row designated 'Superintendent of the North.' Surely the Clerk of the 'Secreit Counsall' must have been showing carelessness.

In the year 1576, we find him appointed by the Assembly one of a commission 'to visit the Colleges of the University of St Andrews, and to consider the same and the manner and state thereof, and what they find to report to the next General Assembly.'

As throwing some light on the strange times in which John Row lived, we may notice the curious position in which he was placed more than once with regard to the Earl of Atholl. This nobleman, John Stewart, was a lineal descendant of John Stewart, commonly called 'the black knight of Lorn,' and of Queen Jane, the widow of James I. He of the sixteenth century, as well as his countess, had remained a Roman Catholic. This displeased the General Assembly, and at its meeting in 1575 a letter was sent to them requiring that they should 'seek conference with Mr John Row, and any other three or four ministers, that they might be instructed in the true religion, and have their doubts of it resolved; with certification that, if this were not done by them before Martinmas next, then Mr Row, with the assistance of the Superintendents of Angus and Fife, and of the ministers of Dundee and Tibbermuir, was to excommunicate them in the Church of Dunkeld; and, if this should be hindered, he was to do it in the parish church of Perth.' For some reason or other—possibly his kindly nature shrank from it—Row did not carry out this instruction of the Supreme Court. James Paton, Bishop of Dunkeld, was then appointed to pronounce the sentence of excommunication, but he also failed to do so. The matter seems to have dragged on for three or four years, when the General Assembly,

in July 1579, refusing to take any excuse from the bishop—though it appears to have taken one from the minister of Perth—appointed Row to visit the district of Dunkeld, demanding the resignation of Paton from the bishopric, and, on his refusal, to excommunicate *him* ! This all seems very strange and very intolerant, but at that time both Churches—protestant and popish—did strangely intolerant things. This Earl of Atholl also in his death troubled the Church. He had become Lord High Chancellor of the kingdom, and died on April 24th, 1579, when holding that high office. Having remained a Roman Catholic to the end, a great funeral according to the Romish rites was arranged for him. The body lay in state for many days, and on July 4th it was to be interred with much pomp in the south aisle of St Giles' Church, Edinburgh. But that date happened to be the opening day of the General Assembly. It was towards evening when the Earl's burial was to take place, and lighted torches were to be used. The figure of a cross, moreover, was to be openly carried. Then the mortcloth was to be covered with a white pall, and the mourners were to wear long gowns decorated with some kind of stripes or fastenings. Thus was popery to flaunt itself in the face of this protestant Assembly met in an ultra-protestant city. The members seriously considered the matter, insisted on the curtailment of the rites and the trappings, and deputed Mr John Row, minister of Perth, and Mr John Durie, one of the ministers of Edinburgh, to go without delay to some of the peers who had arrived to attend the obsequies, and acquaint them with the mind of the Assembly. The lords agreed to a slight modification of the ceremonies, but it would appear that, as the procession passed along the streets, other modifications had likewise to be resorted to. There appears to have been a riot—the city's

history shows that an Edinburgh mob was not easily appeased—and no more was heard of the matter.

Row remained minister of Perth till his death which occurred on October 16th, 1580, when he was fifty-four years of age. Unlike the two previous Johns—John Willock and John Winram—there is some definite information regarding his last days. When we turn to the Kirk-Session (or, as called then, the Weekly Assembly) Records of Perth, we find that in the year 1580 on July 31st he dispensed the Communion for the last time. The names of those present at the Session meeting on 16th October of that year are not given in the Record, and consequently we do not know whether he was present at that meeting. A week or so later he died. Finding that death was approaching, he dictated, and subscribed with his own hand, a kindly and generous letter, addressed to the Weekly Assembly, and to Henry Elder, town-clerk, on behalf of the ‘reader,’ Mr James Smith, whom he regarded as his valuable assistant and friend, and with whom he wished to leave a parting testimony of his esteem. The letter is not engrossed in the minutes, but the substance of it is, and there is contained in it a request that Mr Smith should enjoy what he had promised him, or at least had led him to expect, namely, a salary of ten merks, with the usual perquisites. The letter was read at the assembly of the elders on October 31st, a fortnight and a day after Mr Row’s death, and the meeting unanimously resolved to do what the minister wished.

Our other source of information regarding this Reformer’s last days is in the *Additions to the Coronis*, where we find his grandson saying: ‘There was one passage remarkable in the tyme of his sickness, a little before his death. The Master of the Gramer Schoole, commonlie called Dominie Rind, came to visite him, to



whom he sayes, “ Sir, yee have many smàll bairnes, and alas ! yee have little or no geir to leave them ; what will become of them ? I feare they beg through the countrey. Sir, yee have not been careful to gather geir to them, as well ye might, both at Rome, and since ye came to Scotland.” Mr John Row, turning him to the wall, lay silent a prettie space, pouring out his soule to God ; thereafter turning himself, sayes, “ Dominie, I have been thinking upon that yee have been saying to me ; I will not justifie myselfe, nor say that I have been careful enough to gather geir to my bairnes. I think I might and ought to have done more that way than I have done ; but, Dominie, I have layd over my bairnes upon God and the well-ordered Covenant, and His all-sufficient Providence, for we must lippen much to the old charter, *Providebit Dominus* (Genesis xxii. 8, 14). But, Dominie, let me, tyme about, speake to you ; yee have but one sonne, and yee have great riches to give him, and yee make a god of your geir ; and yee thinke, who but your only sonne, my sonne, he will have enough ! But, Dominie, it feares me yee have little credite and farre less comfort by him, yea it may be that when my bairnes (whom I have layed over upon God’s gracious and all-sufficient Providence) may have competence in the world, your sonne may have much mister, and be beholden to some of myne, for it is God’s blessing that maketh rich ” (Deuteronomy viii. 18). The event did speak the fulfilling of this prophesie of the dying servant of Jesus Christ, for Mr John Row had sixe sonnes and two daughters, all of whom prospered, whereas ‘ Dominie Rind, his only rich heire, he was minister of Dron, and was a very profane and dissolute man, given to drunkenness and many evil vices, so that he became very poore ; and in his own tyme for povertie was forced to sell his bookes to Mr John Row, then schoole-master at Perth,

sonne to Mr John Row, minister at Carnock, the grand-chylde to him that uttered the prophesie. And after his death his wife for povertie turned ane gangrell poore woman, selling some small wares ; and often was refreshed with meate and drink in the house of one of Mr John Row, minister of Carnock, his sonnes, minister at Seiris in Fyfe.'

In our second chapter certain lines, with reference to Willock, are quoted from a Roman Catholic satirical poem of those days. We now give a line from the same poem as showing that Row must have made considerable sacrifice by joining the Protestant cause :—

' Rou custe the vsurie hard be the beuch,'<sup>1</sup>

which means that he threw away his chances of wealth and preferment. It is further to be noted that while the poem is a long one, and many of the Reformers are referred to by name, and are made the objects both of severe animadversions and opprobrious epithets, this is all the satirist has to say about John Row, which is certainly to the credit of the latter.

There are several references to Row in Knox's History, but we have not found therein any opinion expressed concerning him, or estimate given of his character and work. Archbishop Spottiswood (whose father must have known him well) says that ' he was a man who whilst he lived was well respected and was much lamented at his death by the people whom he served.' James Melville in his *Diary* writes: ' About this time (1580) rested happilie in the Lord Mr Johne Row, minister of Saint Johnston, a wise grave father, and of good literature according to his time, who, by the information of my

<sup>1</sup> Literally, ' Row threw away money-making hard by the bough.' ' Hard by the bough ' is difficult to understand, but may mean, ' when he was well under a rich fruit-bearing branch or tree.'

uncle, Mr Andro Melville, laid first in a Generall Assemblie, be doctrine cleirit all the heads of the discipline, to the grait contentation of the hail Kirk, and thereafter continowit a constant promoter thereof to his end.' Calderwood says of him that 'he thundered out mightilie against the estate of the bishops, howbeit in the time of his blindness the Pope was to him as an angel of God.' His own son writes concerning him that 'in Perth, the second burgh of the kingdom, he lived and died beloved and regrated by all good men.'<sup>1</sup>

We gather the great respect in which the people of Perth held their minister from what occurred—as Calderwood in his History informs us about a quarter of a century after Row's death—when his son William was moderator of the Synod ('the Provincial Assemblie') of Perth and Stirling, which met at Perth. There King James VI., through his representative Sir David Murray, threatened severe measures—even to the forcing the younger Row out of the pulpit—if he disobeyed the King's orders (which he was likely to do as he resented the royal interference with the affairs of the Church). But when the said Sir David 'dealt with some of the counsell of the toun and the clerk to travell with him in that mater,' he was told by the civic authorities that the moderator's father had been their minister, that they had great regard for him—his 'memorie was yitt recent'—that his son also was 'gratious amongst the people,' and that if any attempt were made to deal harshly with this moderator, who for his own and his father's sake was dear to them, 'it could not fail to breed insurrection or some other inconvenient.'

Professor Johnston's<sup>2</sup> Latin poem on Row is as follows, and we append a translation of it:—

<sup>1</sup> See Notes 3 and 4.

<sup>2</sup> Professor Johnston. See references in preceding chapters.

## JOHANNES ROWIVS

ECCLESIASTES PERTHENSIS, OBIIT XVI VIIIBRIS AN. 1580

Consilio præstans, rebus auctor gravis agendis,  
 Præcipuos inter, lumina prima patres ;  
 Cognito varia : immensa experientia rerum.  
 Omnigenam linguam mens præit ingenii.  
 Exactor disciplinæ, vindexque severus.  
 Ipse sibi censor, seque ad amussim habuit.  
 Sancta domus, castique lares, frons læta, serena :  
 Larga manus miseris, mensa benigna bonis.  
 Urbis delictum : sancti pia copula amoris  
 Una fides, fidei publica cura simul.  
 Clara viris, cultuque decens, pulcherrima Perthæ :  
 Rowivs at Perthæ haud ultima fama fuit.

## JOHN ROW

MINISTER IN PERTH ; DIED OCTOBER 16, 1580

Well skilled to frame and to achieve a plan,  
 He shone among his peers a noted man.  
 Experience joined its wealth to bookish lore :  
 Full well he spoke, but much he thought before.  
 If sins of others he would sternly stem,  
 His own he was the foremost to condemn.  
 In godly home a happy smile he wore,  
 And Christian bounty drained his purse and store.  
 His townsmen loved him, for with accents clear  
 He taught the sacred truths they held so dear.  
 If Perth can vaunt her beauty, site, and host  
 Of worthies, Row is not her meanest boast.

Lord Guthrie, who has carefully studied this period of Scottish history, gives high praise to this reformer. In a note to his abridged edition of Knox's History he says, ' Among the great leaders of the Scottish Reformation whose fame has been unduly overshadowed by that

of John Knox, one of the most remarkable was the Paduan Doctor of Laws, John Row.'

As already stated, John Row's wife was Margaret Bethune, or Beaton, daughter of John Bethune, or Beaton, of Balfour in Fife, and she bore to him eight sons and two daughters. These in order were: James, who became minister of Kilspindie; William, who became minister of Forgandenny; Catherine, who was married to William Rigg of Atherney; Oliver, who died young; John, who became minister of Carnock; Robert, who appears to have died in infancy; Archibald, who became minister of Stobo; Patrick, who appears to have died young; Colin, who became minister of St Quivox; and Mary, who was married to James Rynd, minister of Longforgan. It is perhaps worth while noting in connection with the baptism of these children, that there were two witnesses, styled godfathers, to each. Among them we observe names such as Lord Methven, the Bishop of Galloway, Campbell of Glenorchy, and a son of Lord Gray. William, the second son, is supposed to have been called after William Lord Ruthven, the first Earl of Gowrie, and a devoted elder of John Row's congregation.

Of two of the above, and two grandsons, some detailed mention should be made.

*William Row*, second son of John Row, was born in 1563. He studied at the University of St Andrews, where he graduated in 1587. About the year 1589 he was appointed minister of Forgandenny, not far from the city of Perth. In connection with the Gowrie Conspiracy, he was cited to appear at Stirling, before the King and Council, as he was one of the ministers who refused to give thanks for the King's escape. The attitude he took up was that, while the whole affair was mysterious, there were certain facts that should



be brought to light. Though told that his life was in danger, if he set out for the meeting of the Council, he went to Stirling, and there with much courage defended his position. At various General Assemblies he spoke as a fearless defender of Presbytery. When in 1607 he occupied the chair as moderator of the Synod held at Perth, and James VI. sent Lord Scone,<sup>1</sup> comptroller and captain of his guard, along with two other commissioners, to compel that court of the Church to accept a permanent moderator, and it was threatened that the guards would discharge their carbines at Row if he disobeyed, he fearlessly preached a sermon of considerable length, in which he denounced the proposed appointment. Throughout his discourse he wisely avoided the designation 'constant moderator,' always referring to such a personage by the learned Latin title of *præses ad vitam*. Lord Scone did not know the language of Cicero and Virgil, and really thought that there was nothing in the sermon against constant moderators—indeed fancied that he had cowed the preacher—but when the Latin words were translated to him his rage knew no bounds, and he addressed Row and other members of the Synod in the most shameful and blasphemous language. When the votes were being counted for the new moderator, Row held the roll of members in his hand, at which the comptroller rose in wrath from his chair, and tried to seize the roll by force; but Row, holding it in his left hand, seized the comptroller with his right and held him firmly in his chair, which was next to the moderator's, till 'he called all the names.'

William Row was put to the horn for this, and ordered to appear before the Privy Council. As he refused to

<sup>1</sup> This is the Sir David Murray of p. 253. He is sometimes styled the one way and sometimes the other in the records of the time.

obey the summons, he was arrested and imprisoned in Blackness Castle, where he lay for seven years, when he was released on the petition of the General Assembly.

In 1624 Alexander Lindsay, Bishop of Dunkeld, who was patron of the parish of Forgandenny, and was an old fellow-student of Row, managed to have the latter's son William appointed his father's assistant and successor. Staunch in his Presbyterianism to the end, even though the Bishop had shown him this favour, he would not recognise in him any ecclesiastical superiority, and, when giving entertainment at the manse, he placed at the head of the table John Malcolm, their former regent at the University, then minister of Perth. William Row died in October 1634.

*John Row*, the fourth (and third surviving) son, was born at Perth probably about the end of December 1568. He received his early education under his father's roof, and must have been a precocious boy. Already we have referred to his acquaintance, as a mere child, with the Hebrew language. When seven years of age he was accustomed to read daily at dinner or supper a chapter of the Old Testament in the original, and at the Grammar School he instructed his master in Hebrew, with the result that the latter was wont to call him Magister John Row. After his father's death he, along with his brother William, enjoyed a friar's pension from the King's Hospital at Perth. His school education over, he went to Kennoway, in Fife, where he taught in the parish school, and also acted as tutor to his nephews the Bethunes of Balfour. These he accompanied to Edinburgh, where he matriculated at the College recently erected in that city, taking his degree of M.A. there in 1590. For two years thereafter he taught in a school at Aberdour, and while there he was also tutor to William, seventh Earl of Morton, to whom on the

mother's side he was related. As Aberdour Castle had the festivity and gaiety of a court, John Row would become acquainted with the ways of the nobility. He was then appointed minister of Carnock, and in 1595 married Grissel, daughter of David Ferguson, minister of Dunfermline.

For over half a century he ministered at Carnock with zeal and success, though more than once tempting offers were made to him of more extensive and more lucrative parishes. Unceasingly and vigorously he opposed all tamperings with Presbytery pure and undefiled, for which the Privy Council made him suffer. On 1st July 1606 he signed the protest to Parliament against the introduction of Episcopacy, and he was one of those who in the same year went to Linlithgow to show their sympathy with Welsh of Ayr and other ministers who were being tried in that town for holding an Assembly at Aberdeen contrary to the royal command. He was a member of the famous Glasgow Assembly of 1638, took part in its business, and was accorded marked respect by his fellow-members. He was also a member of the Assembly which met at Edinburgh in the following year when, the King's Commissioner having given warrant that His Majesty King Charles I. would ratify their proceedings in the approaching Parliament, the utmost satisfaction was expressed; and it is recorded that 'old John Row, being called upon, with tears said, "I blesse, I glorifie, I magnifie the God of heaven and earth that has pittied this poore church and given such matter of joy and consolation; and the Lord make us thankfull first to our gracious and loving God, and next obedient subjects to His Majesty's Commissioner for his owne part."' "

It was during his later years that he wrote his *Historie of the Kirk of Scotland*. For the earlier period he made

use of papers of his father-in-law, Mr Ferguson of Dunfermline. At first the work was circulated in manuscript, and many copies of it were made. In 1842 it was printed for the Wodrow Society, chiefly from a manuscript in the University of Edinburgh. An edition of it was also printed in the same year by the Maitland Club.

John Row died at Carnock on the 26th June 1646, and the monument erected shortly after his death still stands against the wall of the old church there. As perhaps indicating that he was a Scot of the Scots as regards his ecclesiastical views, a thistle surmounts the monument, and, as suggestive of the Row devotion to oriental languages, two Hebrew words, *Beth Ohlam* ('The Last House'), are carved immediately below the Scottish emblem. Fittingly, too, the inscription on the stone is in Latin.

*John Row*, second son of the foregoing, was born at Carnock about the year 1598. He studied at St Andrews, and took his degree of M.A. at St Leonard's College in July 1617. Like his father he was for some time a teacher, his location being Kirkcaldy. Afterwards he became tutor to George, son of the first Earl of Kinnoul, Lord Chancellor of Scotland, by whom he was appointed Master of the Grammar School at Perth, at that time considered 'the most flourishing school in this nation.' Having qualified himself for the ministry he was, in 1641, elected minister of St Nicholas Church, Aberdeen. Like his father and grandfather he was an ardent student of Hebrew, and in 1637 published a Hebrew Grammar appended to which were commendatory Latin verses by several eminent divines. Six years later he published a Hebrew lexicon, which he dedicated to the Town Council of Aberdeen, receiving from them 'for his panes four hundreth merks Scots money.' In 1646

the General Assembly passed an Act recommending its use. The Assembly, in the following year, appointed him to revise a new metrical translation of some of the Psalms. In 1650 he revised and supplemented his father's *History of the Kirk*. From the Records of the Presbytery of Aberdeen, it appears that he intended writing a *History of the Times*, but the intention does not appear to have been carried out. Like his father he was a strong opponent of Episcopacy, and as 'a prime Covenanter' proved obnoxious to the royalist and malignant party in that northern city. During the Cromwellian regime he was appointed Principal of King's College, an office which, as admitted by all, he filled with much credit, maintaining strict discipline, adding to the buildings, and by his learning increasing the reputation of the University. On the approach to Aberdeen of the Marquis of Montrose with the royalist forces, Row with Cant and others of the anti-prelatic party took refuge in the castle of Dunnottar.

In 1651 another work came from his pen, namely, *Praxis Præceptorum Hebraicæ Grammaticæ*, though it is doubtful if it was ever printed. The only other publication by him, of which we know, was a panegyric poem in Latin addressed to Charles II. at the Restoration, which exposed the author to the charge of being a time-serving politician. Perhaps, however, he was unaware of the true character of the 'merry monarch.' Still, seeing the Protector's party had done so much for him, it was surely ungenerous for Row in the poem to refer to Oliver Cromwell as '*trux vilis vermis*,' 'a cruel vile worm.' His expressions of loyalty, in any case, availed him little for, finding himself likely to lose the Principalship, he resigned the office, betook himself to private teaching, and henceforth lived in straitened circumstances. Having been a Covenanter—perhaps even an



Independent—and some of his utterances having been hostile to the royal family, his books were taken out of the College, tied to the Cross of Aberdeen, and burned by the hand of the common hangman.

Latterly Row became an inmate of the house of his son-in-law, John Mercer, minister of Kinellar, where he died about the year 1672. He was interred in the churchyard there, but, unlike his father at Carnock, no stone perpetuates the memory of this Principal of King's College, Aberdeen.

*William Row* was the youngest son of the minister of Carnock, and was probably born in 1612. After completing his University course, he helped his brother John as assistant master in the Grammar School at Perth, which shows that the teaching aptitude was strong in the Row family. The minutes of the Kirk-Session of Carnock inform us that he assisted his father in the years 1642-43, and in 1644 he was admitted minister of Ceres, where he continued for twenty years. His wife was Jean, daughter of Robert Blair, minister of St Andrews. Like his father and brother he adhered to the strictly Presbyterian side in the church's struggles, and in 1665 was ejected from his Church for non-conformity. After the Battle of Bothwell Bridge, in 1679, William Row, under the third Indulgence was allowed to hold meetings in private, and to preach, but no nearer than two miles from Ceres. When this Indulgence was recalled, he was summoned before the Privy Council and forbidden in 1680 to preach at all. He survived to a good old age, and after the Revolution was restored to his former charge. He died about the year 1700. Like his brother John, he added some material to his father's *History of the Kirk*, but it is no easy matter to distinguish which parts are John's and which are William's. The additions are

contained in the *Coronis* and in the *Additions to the Coronis*.

If we consider John Row, *primus*, as beginning his public work in the pre-Reformation Church in 1550, and his grandson William Row as closing his career in the Reformed Church in, or about, 1700, we have one hundred and fifty years of good service rendered by three generations of the Row family. Moreover, one or more of their descendants continued this service in the Scottish Church for some decades longer. It is an excellent and somewhat unusual record. Among them, they made and wrote history.

## APPENDIX

### NOTE 1

#### THE HERMIT OF LORETTO

This was Thomas Douchtie of whom the *Diurnal of Occurents* says: 'In this mene tyme (1533) thair come ane heremeit called Thomas Douchtie, in Scotland, quha had been long capitaine (captive ?) befor the Turks, as was allegit, and brocht ane ymage of our Lady with him, and fundit the cheppil of Laureit besyd Musselburgh.' The Earl of Glencairn, in a satirical poem of that time, calls Thomas, or rather makes Thomas call himself, 'a cullurane (cullroun, silly fellow) kythed throw many a land,' and George Buchanan, in his *History*, says that he was an impostor who made great gain by fictitious miracles.

### NOTE 2

#### JAMES THORNTON

This Scotsman appears to have been a man of some importance in Rome and elsewhere. He was Secretary to the Archbishop of Glasgow. Father Pollen, in his *Papal Negotiations with Mary, Queen of Scots*, makes mention of him more than once. In 1559-60 we find Thornton writing two letters of con-

siderable length to Mary of Guise, Queen Dowager and Regent of Scotland, dealing with sundry ecclesiastical matters. As 'the Ambassadors of Scotland's Secretaire,' he, in 1565, is the bearer of certain despatches from Rome to the Cardinal of Lorraine, in connection with the dispensation for Darnley's marriage with Mary, and in the same year he carries letters from Mary to her uncles and others relating to the same subject. Not long after we find him arriving in Edinburgh evidently on secret State business, and James Thornton's courier-bag seems to have contained a good deal of dangerous and treasonable matter. One wonders if Row and he—old fellow-labourers in the papal city and both speaking Italian fluently—would meet again in the home country and have some converse. Their experiences were certainly very different during six years of separation.

## NOTE 3

## CHURCH DISCIPLINE IN JOHN ROW'S TIME

The Rev. James Scott, who was minister of Perth at the beginning of last century, and who wrote *A History of the Lives of the Protestant Reformers in Scotland*, made researches into the Records of the Session of Perth for information regarding the work of the ministry in Row's time, and we cull the following from his researches: 'Towards the end of the year 1560, Mr Row began to reside as a stated pastor with the people of Perth. The record, now extant, of the discipline of his parish, does not commence till May 1577, so that it does not certainly appear what were the earliest methods which he took for instructing the people, and amending their morals; but most probably they were much the same with those which he afterwards made use of . . . Every Lord's Day he preached both in the forenoon and afternoon. He preached also a sermon every Thursday, to which the parishioners of all ranks were strictly enjoined to resort. It may be noticed, that when he was to catechise the people, especially before dispensing the Communion, the elders were required, with the help of the magistrates, to take up the names of the people, and to be present when the persons belonging to their several districts were to be examined. He indeed seemed to think that the assistance of the elders who bare rule, but did not labour in word and doctrine, was of great importance; for when, visiting houses and sick persons, he

chose to have one or two of them along with him, to add weight to his ministrations. But these good men also, of their own accord, frequently visited and prayed with the sick . . . They, with the church-deacons, united in distributing the funds of the poor ; but it was the elders only who could vote with the minister in matters of discipline.

‘Two methods, which were found successful, were employed for exciting the people to be diligent in learning the principles of religion. No parent could have his child baptized unless he could repeat the Creed, the Lord’s Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, and no persons were to be contracted for marriage, or to have their banns proclaimed, until they had previously been so well instructed by the “reader” as to be able to declare to the minister and elders the holy purposes of the institution. . . . The daily morning prayers began at a very early hour. The Societies of the Guild and Trades were bound to provide, during the winter season, lights in the church for their own and the people’s conveniency. . . . Many of the “readers,” having done well in their office, were afterwards admitted to the holy ministry, and had parishes assigned them. During the last year of Mr Row’s life, Mr James Smith, a man much approven, was “reader” in the church of Perth, and in 1582 became minister of Errol. In Mr Row’s time, and in some succeeding years, Mr John Swenton was “uptaker of the psalm in the Kirk, and master of the sang-school.” He was provided with a salary, a school building, a dwelling-house, and a garden. The people delighted in church music in all its parts, but the minister and elders found it necessary to enjoin Mr John Swenton to keep to the tenor part of the tune himself, when he was in the desk, lest he “should confuse the people in their singing.” The weekly meeting of the “exercise,” or “eldership” as it was likewise called, was another means of public instruction afforded to the people. It consisted of the minister of the town, and some other ministers, who met every Wednesday for prayer, for improving themselves by exercise, in the gift of preaching, and for counselling and encouraging one another in the business of their several parishes. Some lay-elders also attended. A minister present delivered a critical discourse on a text of Scripture, and another added a practical application. . . . At this period the civil magistrates amicably concurred in enforcing the acts of the parochial meetings. William, Lord Ruthven, who was annually chosen provost of the town, and Mr Row,

who was respected as one of the reformers, and who generally was invested with the character of an ecclesiastical commissioner or superintendent, joined their endeavours for the public good. This Lord Ruthven, who was afterwards created Earl of Gowrie, was a religious man, a sincere Protestant, and a wise and able statesman. After he had been beheaded at Stirling, in 1584, his death was severely felt at Perth, for considerable alterations immediately took place. Debates arose between the civil and ecclesiastical rulers, and irritating faults were evidently committed on both sides. But Mr Row did not live to see this change, or to be troubled with the disagreeable occurrences which followed.

'In Mr Row's time, offenders of all kinds, excepting thieves and murderers, whom the magistrates took into their own hands, were cited to appear before the weekly assembly. Besides, being enjoined to "make their repentance in the church," that is, to do penance on the repenting stool in presence of the congregation, civil punishments were ordered, such as fines, imprisonments in the tolbooth, the disgrace of standing in the irons at the cross, or on the cuck-stool; and frequently the delinquents were sent to an old tower, close adjoining the church, which then bore, as it still does, the name of "Halkerstone's Tower," where, for a certain time, they were to have no other food than bread and water. . . . The seventh commandment had been shamefully disregarded in Popish times. The population of the town and parish may be reckoned not much to have exceeded six thousand; yet, even during the last three years of Mr Row's life, which was after sixteen years had passed in strenuous endeavours for reformation, above eighty such transgressors were annually convicted. Other vices which were detrimental and disgraceful to society were strictly noticed—fighting, flyting, and even opprobrious language did not escape punishment. For instance on May 25th, 1579, "Thomas Malcom is convicted, before the weekly assembly, of having called Thomas Broun a "loun carle" (worthless fellow), for which the assembly ordained him to be put in the tolbooth two hours, and to pay six shillings and eight pennies to the poor."

'The licentious pageantry of the old church was sometimes attempted to be revived. There were plays, or dramatic performances, which were called "mysteries, moralities, and scurillities," in the last of which, especially, not only satire but much ribaldry was introduced. Here is an entry of July 1st, 1577.



"The weekly assembly regret that certain inhabitants of this town, against the express command of the civil magistrate, and the prohibition delivered by the minister from the pulpit, have played Corpus Christi play upon the sixth day of June last, which day was wont to be called Corpus Christi's day; whereby they have offended the Church of God, and dishonoured this whole town; the said play being idolatrous and superstitious." The assembly ordained that the guilty persons should receive no benefit from the Church till they had shown evidence of their repentance. About fourteen persons, not of the meanest rank in the town, are mentioned as having been guilty of this fault. But by my Lord Ruthven's advice, the chief actor among them came voluntarily to the weekly assembly, and submitted himself to the pleasure of the church; and the minister and elders, having heard his confession and his promise of not committing the like fault again, agreed to readmit him to church privileges. His associates afterwards followed his example, and were forgiven. . . .

'A similar offence, however, soon occurred. On December 16th, 1577, "it is ordained that the Act against superstition, November 27th, 1574, shall be published on Sunday next; also, that all persons who were playing Sanctobertis play, on the tenth of this month, shall be warned to compear this day eight days." A very great number of persons had been engaged in this play. On the tenth of December, which was wont to be called "Sanctobertis eve," they had passed through the town in disguised dresses, with piping and dancing, and striking a drum. They had carried in their hands burning torches. One of the actors was clad in the devil's coat; another rode upon a horse, which went in men's shoes. Probably the horse and its rider represented a part of the legendary history of the saint. I have not met with any satisfactory account of St Obert, Berth, or Bert; but the personage, whether real or imaginary, seems to have been a patron saint made choice of by the bakers' corporation, for the offenders were of that trade. Notwithstanding the penalties inflicted upon them, this play was several times acted after Mr Row's death; till, at the beginning of the year 1588, the baker corporation enacted, in their books, that such persons as should play, in any time to come, Sanctobertis play, should be "debarred from all the liberties of the craft, should never have entry to the same again, and should be banished from the town for ever." An attested copy of this Act was sent to the

minister and elders, that it might be inserted also in the book of the weekly assembly.

‘Another specimen of the ancient manners is yet to be mentioned. Many of the young people of both sexes had been accustomed to practise in the month of May a pastime which was reckoned superstitious. It is thus noticed in the record : “ May 2, 1580. It was agreed that an Act should be passed by the minister Mr John Row, discharging all persons from passing to the Dragon Hole superstitiously ; also, that the same should be published on Thursday next out of the pulpit, and thereafter given to the bailies to be published at the mercat-cross.” . . . The Dragon Hole was a cave situated on the hill of Kinnoull, on the east side of the river Tay, and at a short distance from Perth. The young people of both sexes, in the popish times, and most probably also in the times of heathenism, resorted to it in companies at “ Belteine ” or “ Bel-Fire-Time,” in the month of May. By the fall of a rock, the cave is now almost entirely demolished, or rendered wholly inaccessible. . . . I think it necessary to remark that the prohibition of some pastimes, which were once practised by the people did not proceed merely from the austere temper of the Reformed Church, or from a fear of superstition, but from a conviction of the irregularities and dangerous quarrels of which they were often the occasion ; for there is an Act of the Scots Parliament, in 1555, which was five years prior to the establishment of the Reformation, by which it was statute and ordained, that no person, in time to come, shall be chosen to the office of “ Robin Hude, Little John, Abbot of Unreason, and Queen of May ; and that all women singing about summer trees, thereby giving disturbance to travellers, shall be taken, and put upon the cuck-stool of the burgh or toun.” ’

Scott, in the above, says he has ‘ not met with any satisfactory account of St Obert, Berth, or Bert,’ but a writer of this century, James M. Mackinlay, M.A., F.S.A., has been more successful, and from his *Ancient Church Dedications in Scotland* (vol. ii., Non-Scriptural Dedications), we cull the following :—

St Obert was St Aubert a bishop who lived in the seventh century and is supposed to have been born at Cambrai. In the north-east of France and in Belgium he was regarded as the patron saint of bakers, in whose welfare he is said to have personally interested himself. Accordingly in art he is sometimes represented accompanied by an ass bearing panniers full

of loaves, and having a purse attached to its neck. In Ghent Cathedral he has a peel or baker's shovel as his special emblem. His name took various forms in Scotland, such as Obert, Towbert, and Cobert, but never, as suggested by Scott, Berth or Bert, and the Scottish bakers considered him their patron saint. The baxters of Edinburgh, St Andrews and Dundee, had altars bearing his name in the churches of St Giles', the Holy Trinity, and St Mary's respectively. Stirling also had an altar dedicated to him. Though specially zealous in attending to the cultus of St Aubert, the bakers at Perth seem to have had no chapel or altar dedicated to him in their city.

We may add that it is well known to Scottish historians that the annual frolic of Robin Hood and Little John was attended with horseplay of the coarsest kind and ended in shameful riot and drunkenness. Public feeling had turned against these unseemly exhibitions before Knox came to the front. Moreover, the merchants and craftsmen had become opposed to them owing to the time and money spent in their preparation and performance.

#### NOTE 4

##### A COMMUNION SUNDAY IN JOHN ROW'S CHURCH

We are also indebted to Mr Scott for the following: 'The last important action in which I have found Mr Row engaged was his dispensing the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The day of its celebration was the last Sabbath of July, viz. July 31st, 1580. I wish to take the opportunity of giving an account of the manner in which that divine ordinance was administered at so early a period of the Reformed Church. A previous meeting of the weekly assembly was held on Monday, July 25th. From what passed at that meeting it would appear that the choir, or east end of the church, where the high altar had formerly stood, but which was now generally vacant of seats, was that part of the church of Perth which was to be occupied by the tables, and seats for the communicants. It seems, on this occasion, to have been enclosed with a low fence, or vail, in which were two doors. Two of the magistraes, to prevent indecency, or any tumult, consented to attend at these two doors, and other two of them at the outward doors of the church.

'Two of the church-deacons were to receive from the com-

municants, as they entered, at one or other of the inner doors, the tickets (tokens for communion), and also the voluntary alms which they were to offer to the poor. Three deacons were to bring the wine, as it was needed, from the vestry. Two elders were to convey the element of bread along the tables; and four deacons were to convey the cups. The names of these respectable men are set down in the record. All the other elders and deacons were to await in the choir during the whole time of the service. A person was nominated to prepare the bread, and the thesaurer (treasurer) was to prepare the tokens and the napery. . . . According to the record at Perth, in 1580, "The weekly assembly (session) ordered, that to the first ministration the first bell should ring at four hours in the morning, the second at half-hour to five, and the third at five; that to the second ministration the first bell should ring at half-hour to nine, the second at nine, and the third at half-hour to ten." Thus three full hours might be spent in the first ministration, and the second, perhaps, might be of longer continuance. These hours of communicating were suited to the ancient habits of the people, or rather, it may be said, were so regulated as to keep up the remembrance that our Saviour's last sufferings began early in the morning.

'It is probable, that at the time of the evening prayers, more time than usual would be spent in the reading of the Scriptures; and the "reader," Mr James Smith, who also seems to have been an "exhorter," might engage in suitable exhortations to the people. When the curfew bell was rung, that is, at eight every night, it may be supposed that these good people also, who, from early hours, had been so religiously employed through the day, would be all quietly resting in their houses.

'It is proper to observe, that no mention is made of the appointment of a fast-day, of a preparatory service on the Saturday, or of a thanksgiving sermon on the Monday. It was forty years after this date that these appendages to the Communion were introduced by some ministers, who reckoned them expedient on account of the peculiar circumstances of their people. In Mr Row's time, the minister of a parish, with the help of the "reader," could administer the Communion, without having any other minister to assist him.

'I shall describe the form, which is contained in the old *Book of Common Order*, and which, from the beginning, was long practised by the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. On the

Communion Sabbath, the minister was to preach as usual ; but before he left the pulpit, he was to read the account which the Apostle Paul gives of the institution. He was next to address an exhortation to the people, in the course of which he was to fence the tables, much in the same way as is now done. Having come down to the table, he was to take the bread into his hands, but before he brake it, he and all the congregation were to join together in a general thanksgiving.

‘ Our reformers were afraid of seeming to give any countenance to the idolatrous use which the papists made of this ordinance, which may have been the reason that, in the thanksgiving, there is no mention made of the bread and wine, and no petition is offered. It consists of an ascription of praise for redeeming love, and a profession of remembering the death of our Saviour, and of looking through Him for every benefit that we stand in need of. What was deficient, however, in the old form, was afterwards supplied by the new directory, in 1645.

‘ The minister, after breaking the bread, was to give it to the people, enjoining them to distribute it among themselves, and the cup, himself partaking of both along with them. No exhortation was to be given by the minister to the people when they were at the table ; but the book says, “ Such places of Scripture, as most lively set forth the death of Christ, are to be read,” (which most probably was done by the “ reader ” at the desk), “ to the intent that our eyes and senses may not be entirely occupied in these outward signs of bread and wine, which is called the visible Word, but that our minds also may be fully fixed in the contemplation of the Lord’s death, which is by this holy Sacrament represented.”

‘ When the action of communicating was ended, the minister and people were to pray, thanking God for the great privilege they had enjoyed, and praying that they might continue mindful of his saving benefits. Then the hundred and third psalm, or some other such psalm, or hymn, was to be sung ; and the blessing having been pronounced (which was either the form anciently prescribed in Numbers vi. 24-26, or that which is contained in 2 Corinthians xiii. 14, for both were occasionally used), “ the people were to rise from the tables and to depart.” ’



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Knox's *History*.  
Calderwood's *History*.  
Row's *History*.  
Spottiswood's *History*.  
James Melville's *Diary*.  
*Booke of the Universall Kirk*.  
Wodrow's *Analecta*.  
James Scott's *History of the Lives of Protestant Reformers in Scotland*.  
Hew Scott's *Fasti Ecclesiæ Scoticanæ*.  
M'Crie's *John Knox*.  
M'Crie's *Andrew Melville*.  
M'Crie's (*secundus*) *Story of the Scottish Church*.  
*Dictionary of National Biography*. Article, 'John Row.'  
*Pre-Reformation Scholars in Scotland in the XVIth Century*, by  
W. Forbes Leith.  
Grant's *History of the Burgh Schools of Scotland*.  
Lawson's *Book of Perth*.  
*Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*.  
*Acts of the Parliament of Scotland*.  
Pollen's *Papal Negotiations with Mary, Queen of Scots*. Scottish  
History Society.

## CHAPTER VI

### JOHN SPOTTISWOOD

It has taken nearly four centuries to make an Episcopalian, or rather it should be said an Archbishop, out of the Row blood, for the present occupant of the Episcopal throne at York—the Most Reverend Cosmo Gordon Lang, D.D., D.C.L.—is a direct descendant of the minister of Perth; but in the case of the family to which the Reformer who now concerns us belongs, namely, John Spottiswood,<sup>1</sup> one generation was sufficient for the transmutation.

John Spottiswood *secundus*, who became Archbishop of St Andrews and Lord Chancellor of Scotland, says that his father was latterly dissatisfied with Presbytery. His actual words are—‘In his last days, when he saw the ministers take such liberty as they did, and heard of the disorders raised in the Church through that confused parity which men laboured to introduce, as likewise the irritations the King received from a sort of foolish preachers, he lamented extremely the case of the Church to those that came to visit him who were not a few, and of the better sort. He continually foretold that the ministers by their follies would bring

<sup>1</sup> There is considerable variety in the spelling of this name—Spotswood, Spotiswood, Spottiswood, and Spottiswoode—but we think there is most to be said for the above, which is that of the *Dictionary of National Biography*. It is well to drop the archaic spelling of these surnames, as we have already done in the cases of Winram and Row; and indeed also in the case of Willock, though Willocks is a common form in the old documents and histories.

religion in hazard, and, as he feared, provoke the King to forsake the truth; therefore he wished some to be placed in authority over them to keep them in awe.' We shall make further reference to this, and to other observations of John Spottiswood *primus*, at the close of this chapter; but meanwhile it may be said, with regard to the son, that he himself for many years after his father's death sided with the stricter Presbyterian party, and it was indeed by supporting their policy that he came into prominence as a church leader. In an old folio edition before us of Archbishop Spottiswood's History—printed in London in 1677<sup>1</sup>—there is prefixed a Life of the author by Bryan (Duppa), Bishop of Winchester, in which the latter says that the father of the Archbishop 'exercised the power and discharged faithfully the office of bishop though under another style,' which remark is certainly inaccurate as, we think, is clearly evident from what has been already said in previous chapters on the office of Superintendent; and which it would be superfluous to repeat here. In the *Coronis* to Row's History, we have the following entirely different statement: 'I will speak somewhat more particularly of Mr John Spottiswood, father of this same Spottiswood, now Archbishop of St Andrews, Primate of Scotland and High Chancellor there; he would never have consented that his son should have embraced such an office and unlawful calling, as is evident by his grave, wise and holy, humble answers at his admission.' These answers, an utter negation of anything like diocesan Episcopacy, were given in the year 1560, and John Spottiswood lived for fully a quarter of a century after. He may have changed his views somewhat in the course of these years, but if so the Row family would have been likely to know of the

<sup>1</sup> The first edition appeared in the year 1655.

alteration or modification, and the historian, or chronicler, among them would not have written as above.

Seeing we have referred several times in these biographies to the Superintendents, it may be of interest here to give the rubric of their admission, more particularly as the only copy we know of is in connection with the admission of the subject of this chapter. Knox gives it in full in his History, and it is as follows :—

‘The Forme and Ordour of the Electioun of the Superintendent, quhilk may serve also in Electioun of all uther Ministers.

‘At Edinburghe, the 9th of Merche 1560 years, Johne Knox being Minister

‘First was made a Sermone, in the quilk thir Heids war intreated.

‘1. The necessity of Ministers and Superintendents.  
2. The crymes and vyces that micht unable thame (of the Ministrie). The vertues required in thame. And last, Quhidder sick as by publict consent of the Kyrk were callit to sick office, micht refuis the same.

‘The Sermone finisched, it was declared be the same Minister (maker thareof) that the Lords of Secrete Councell had given charge and power to the Kirkes of Louthiane, to chuse MR JOHN SPOTTISWOODE Superintendent; and that sufficient warning was made be publict edict to the Kirkes of Edinburghe, Linlithgow, Striveling, Tranent, Haddingtoun and Dunbar; as also to Earles, Lords, Barons, Gentilmen, and uthers, having or quho micht claime to have, voite in Electioun, to be present that day, at that same hour: And, therefore inquisitioun was made, Quho wer present and quho wer absent.

‘Efter was called the said Mr Johne, quho answering: the Minister demanded, Gif ony man knew ony cryme or offence to the said Mr Johne, that micht unabill him to be called to that office? And this he demanded

thryis. Secundlie, Question was moved to the haille multitude, If thair was any uther quhome they wald put in Electioun with the said Mr Johne. The pepill wer asked, If they wald have the said Mr Johne Superintendent? If they wald honour and obey him as Christis Minister? And comfort and assist him in everything perteening to his charge? They answerit, —We will, and we do promise unto him sic obedience as becometh the scheip to give unto thair Pastour, sa lang as he remains faythfull in his office.

‘The Answers of the Pepill, and thair consents received, thir Questionis war proponit unto him that was to be elected.

‘Question.—Seeing that ye hear the thirst [trust?] and desyre of this people, do ye not think yourself bound in conscience befor God to support thaim that so earnestly call for your comfort, and for the fruit of your labours?

‘Answer.—If anything wer in me abil to satisfie thair desyr, I acknowledge myself bound to obey God calling by thame.

‘Question.—Do ye seek to be promoted to this Office and Charge, for ony respect of warldly commoditie, riches or glory?

‘Answer.—God knowes the contrarie.

‘Question.—Beleve ye not that the doctrine of the Propheits and Apostles, contained in the buiks of the Auld and New Testaments, is the only trew and most absolute foundation of the Universall Kirk of Christ Jesus, in sa mekill that in the same Scriptures ar contained all things necessary to be beleved for the salvation of Mankind?

‘Answer.—I hereby beleve the same, and do abhor and utterly refuis all Doctrines alleged necessary to Salvatioun, that is not expressely contained in the same.

‘Question.—Is not Christ Jesus Man of man, accord-



ing to the flesche, to wit, the Sone of David, the Seid of Abrahame, conceived by the Holy Ghost, borne of the Virgin Marie his mother, the only Head and Mediator of his Kirk ?

‘ Answer.—He is, and without Him thair is nouthir, Salvation to man, nor lyfe to angell.

‘ Questioun.—Is not the same Lord Jesus [the] only trew God, the Eternall Sone of the Eternall Father, in quhome all that sall be saved wer elected befor the foundation of the world was laid ?

‘ Answer.—I confes and acknowlege Him in unitie of his Godheid, to be God above all things blessit for evir.

‘ Questioun.—Sall not they quhome God in His eternall counsell hes electit, be callit to the knowledge of his Sone, our Lord Jesus ? And sall not they quhome of purpois are elected in this lyfe be justified ? And is not justification and free remission of sinnes obtained in this lyfe by free grace ? Sall not this glory of the sonnes of God follow in the general resurrection, quhen the Sone of God sall appeir in his glorious majesty ?

‘ Answer.—I acknowlege this to be doctrine of the Apostles and the most singular comfort of God’s children.

‘ Questioun.—Will ye not contein yourself in all doctrines within the bounds of this foundation ? Will ye not study to promote the same, alsweile by your lyfe as by your doctrine ? Will ye not, according to the graces and utterance that God sall grant unto you, profes, instructe and maintene the purity of the doctrine contained in the sacred Word of God ? And, to the uttermost of your powers, will ye not ganestand and convince the gaynsayers and teichers of mennis inventions ?

‘ Answer.—That I do promeis in the presence of God and of His congregation heir assembled.

‘ Question.—Know ye not that the excellency of this Office to the quhilk God has called yow, requires that your conversatioun and behaviour be sick, as that ye may be irreprehensible ; yea, even in the eyes of the ungodly ?

‘ Answer.—I unfaynedly acknowledge, and humilly desyre the Kirk of God to pray with me, that my lyfe be not scandalous to the glorious Evangell of Jesus Christ.

‘ Question.—Because ye are a man compassed with infirmity, will ye not charitably, and with lowliness of Spirit receive admonition of your Brethren ? And if ye sall happen to slyde, or offend in any one point, will ye not be subject to the Discipline of the Kirk, as the rest of your Brethren ?

‘ The Answer of the Superintendent, or Minister, to be elected—I acknowlege myself to be a man subject to infirmity, and ane that hes neid of correction and admonition ; and thairfor I maist willingly submit and subject myself to the hailsum discipline of the Kirk ; yea, to the discipline of the same Kirk by the which I am now called to this chairge ; and heir in God’s presence and youris do promeis obedience to all admonitiones, secretly or publicly given ; unto the quhilk, if I be found inobedient, I confess myself most worthie to be ejected not only from this honour, but also from the Society of the Faythfull, in cais of my stubbornes : For the vocation of God to bear charge within his Kirk, maketh men not tyrantes nor lordis, but appoynteth thame servandis, Watchmen, and Pastoris of the Flock.

‘ This ended, Question now be asked agane of the multitude.

‘ Question.—Requires ye ony further of this your Superintendent ?

‘ If no man answer, let the Minister proceed. Will ye

not acknowlege this your Brother, for the Minister of Christ Jesus. Will ye not reverence the Word of God that procede fra his mouthe. Will ye not receave of him the sermone of exhortation with patience, not refusing the hailsome medicine of your saulis, althocht it be bitter and unpleising to the flesche? Will ye not, finally, mantene and comforte him in his ministry against all sic as wickedly wald rebell against God and his holy ordinance?

‘The Peple answereth.—We will, as we will answer to the Lord Jesus, quho has commandit his Ministeris to be had in reverence, as his ambassadours, and as men that cairfully watche for the salvatioun of our saulis.

‘Let the Nobility also be urged with this.—Ye have heard the dewty and professioun of this your Brother, by your consentis appointed to this charge; as also the dewty and obedience quhilk God requireth of us towards him heir in his ministry. Bot because that neyther of both are abill to performe onything without the especial grace of our God in Christ Jesus, quho has promised to be with us present, even to the consummation of the world; with unfayned hairtis let us crave of him his benedictioun and assistance in this work begun to his glory, and for the comfort of his Kirk.

#### ‘THE PRAYER

‘O Lord, to quhome all power is given in heavin and in eirthe, thow that art the Eternall Sone of the Eternall Father quho hes not only so luifit thy Church, that for the redemptioun and purgatioun of the same thow has humilled thyself to the deyth of the Croce; and thereupon has sched thy most innocent bluid to prepair thyself a Spous without spott, but also to retein this thy most excellent benefite in memory, has appoynted

in thy Kirk Teichars, Pastores and Apostles to instruct, comfort and admonische the same: Luik upon us mercifully, O Lord, thow that only art King, Teichar and Hie Priest to thy awin flock; and send unto this our Brother, quhome in thy name we have chairged with the chief cair of thy Kirk, within the bounds of Louthiane, sick portioun of thy Holy Spreit, as thereby he may rychtly devyde thy Word to the instructioun of thy flocke, and to the confutatioun of pernitiuous erroures, and damnable superstitiones. Give unto him, gude Lord, a mouthe and wisdom, quhareby the enemies of thy truthe may be confounded; the wolfis expellit, and driven from thy fauld, thy scheip may be fed in the hailsum pastures of thy most holy word, the blind and ignorant may be illuminated with thy trew knowlege. Finally, that the dregis of superstitioun and idolatry quhilk yit restis within this Realme, being purged and removed, we may all not only have occasion to glorifie thee our onely Lord and Saviour, but also to dayly grow in godlines and obedience of thy most holy will, to the destructioun of the body of synne, and to the restitutioun of that image to the quhilk, efter our fall and defectioun, we are renewed by participation of thy Holy Spreit, quhilk by trew fayth in thee, we do profess as the blissit of thy Father of whom the perpetual increas of thy graces we crave, as by thee our Lord and King and onely Bishope, we are taucht to pray, saying "Our Father that art in hevin," etc.

' The prayer ended, the rest of our Ministers, if ony be, our Elders of the Kirk present, in signe of thair consentis, sall tak the elected by the hand and then the chief Minister sall giff the benediction as follows :—

' God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, quho hes commanded his Evangell to be preiched to the comfort of his Elect, and has called thee to the office of a Watchman over his people, multiply his graces with thee,

illuminat thee with his Holy Spreit, comfort and strengthen thee in all vertewe, governe and guyde thy ministry to the prayse of his holy Name, to the propagation of Christ's Kingdome, to the comfort of his Kirk, and finally to the plain dischaige and assurance of thy awin conscience in the day of the Lord Jesus, to quhome, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, be all honour, prayse, and glory, now and for ever. So be it.

‘ THE LAST EXHORTATION TO THE ELECTED

‘ Take heid to thyself, and unto the Flocke committed to thy chaarge ; feid the same cairfully, not as it were of compulsion, bot of very love quhilk thow bearest to the Lord Jesus. Walk in simplicity and purenes of lyfe, as it becometh the trew servand and ambassadour of the Lord Jesus. Usurpe not dominion nor tryannical impyre over thy brethrein. Be not discouraged in adversity, but lay before thyself the example of Prophets, Apostles, and of the Lord Jesus, quho in thair Ministry sustened contradictioun, contempt, persecutioun and deyth. Feir not to rebuik the warld of sinne, justice and jugement. If anything succeid prosperously in thy vocation, be not puft upe with pryde, neyther yet flatter thyself as that the gude succes proceed from thy vertew, industry, or cair. Bot let ever that sentence of the Apostle remane in thy hairt : “ Quhat hes thou, quhilk thou hes not recavit? If thou hes recavit, quhy gloriest thou ? ” Comfort the afflicted, support the puir, and exhort utheris to support thame. Be not solist for things of this lyfe, but be fervent in prayer to God for incress of his Holy Spreit. And, finally, behave thyself in this holy vocation with sick sobriety, as God may be glorified in thy ministry. And so sall thow shortly obtain the victory, and sall receive the crown promised, quhen the Lord



Jesus sall appeir in his glory, quhois omnípotent Spreit assist thee unto the end. Amen

‘Then sing the 23rd Psalme.’

But now we must proceed to tell the life-story of this Superintendent who was so solemnly set apart for his work in the Church. John Spottiswood was born in the year 1510, and was the second son of William Spottiswood of that ilk who fell with his king in the battle of Flodden in 1513. His mother was Elizabeth, daughter of Henry Hop-Pringle of Torsonce. The Spottiswoods were an old family, and can be traced back to Robert Spottiswood who possessed the Barony of Spottiswood, Berwickshire, in the reign of Alexander III. John was left an orphan at the age of three years, but his son says that he had friends who helped him. He entered the University of Glasgow in 1534,<sup>1</sup> and his name occurs at that time in the University Records. There he is designated ‘servus domini Rectoris,’ which is a designation we seldom find in the records. There was no such regularly appointed officer of the University, but the student who became ‘servus domini Rectoris’ would be merely the private servitor of that dignitary, who was generally one of the prebendaries of Glasgow. John Spottiswood’s name has not been discovered in the graduation lists of the Faculty of Arts, but the Archbishop affirms that his father took his M.A. degree at Glasgow. We have seen it stated that he studied Divinity under John Major in the western University, but that is impossible as Major was transferred to St Andrews in 1523. Spottiswood intended studying for the Church, but the persecution of heretics in Glasgow—possibly he witnessed the martyrdom of two young men of good education and gentle nature, Alexander Kennedy and Jerome Russell—gave him such a dis-

<sup>1</sup> See Note 1.

taste for Church doctrine and practice, that about the year 1539 he repaired to London with the intention of following some other calling. In that city, however, he came under the influence of Archbishop Cranmer, who had become attracted to the young Scotsman, and admitted him to holy orders. We have no information as to how Spottiswood was employed during his stay in England, but it has been conjectured that he resided chiefly in the Archbishop's family, officiated as chaplain to His Grace, and assisted him in his public business. He would thus become fairly well known at the English Court.

In the year 1543 he returned to Scotland. The time was opportune, and it was safe and patriotic for Spottiswood to retrace his steps northward. James V. had died in the previous year, leaving a daughter seven days old ; the Earl of Arran, a reputed Protestant, was Regent of the Kingdom ; Cardinal Beaton was in disgrace and a prisoner in Blackness Castle ; and the Protestants were becoming numerous and influential. Henry VIII. was very desirous of a marriage between his son Edward and the infant Scottish Queen, and was employing various means to accomplish his purpose. Among these was the sending of an ambassador to Scotland, and the release of the Scottish noblemen who had been detained in England as prisoners since the battle of Solway Moss, on the condition that when they returned home they should use their endeavours to promote King Henry's marriage scheme. As this monarch relied on the Protestant party, he also sent some preachers from England to promote the cause of the Reformation. Things indeed seemed wonderfully bright in Scotland. In this very year, 1543, its Parliament passed an Act rendering it lawful for people to read the Bible in their mother tongue. Knox says of this time : ' Then might have been seen the Bible lying

on almost every gentleman's table ; the New Testament was borne about in many hands ; the knowledge of God did wonderfully increase ; and He gave His Holy Spirit to simple men in great abundance.' But clouds soon gathered on the horizon, and dark days followed.

When Spottiswood returned to his native land, it was in the company of the released noblemen, and with one of these he was particularly intimate. This was the Earl of Glencairn, who was ever his steadfast friend and powerful protector. Spottiswood for a while resided at Finlayston, the earl's family seat—a meeting place of Protestants—and doubtless he would officiate there as chaplain. He would become intimate with the members of this noble family. There was Alexander, Lord Kilmaurs, the eldest surviving son, who bore a high character and was engaged in many public affairs. Sir Ralph Sadler, in a letter to Henry VIII., says of him : ' In my poor opinion, there are few such men in Scotland both for wisdom and learning, and for his being so well addicted to Christ's word and doctrine.' He afterwards became that Earl of Glencairn—the fifth earl—who was so brave and energetic on the side of reform, and was so friendly with John Knox, winning from the latter special applause for his steadfastness and sincerity. Many years before, this nobleman had shown his attitude towards the Romish clergy by a stinging satire upon the Franciscans—to which Knox gives a place in his History—entitling the piece ' Ane Epistle direct fra the Holye Armitte of Allarit (*i.e.* the Holy Hermit of Loretto near Musselburgh) to his Brethrien the Gray Freires.' Knox certainly owed much to this earl, as the following incident will show. When the former and his supporters were in Perth, they were in danger from the army of the Queen Regent, and this royal lady was so angry with them that she vowed she would utterly

destroy St Johnston (Perth), man, woman and child, burn it with fire and sow it with salt. But away down in Ayrshire, at the old kirk of Craigie, certain letters were read one day to the gentlemen of Kyle and Cunningham assembled there, informing them of the dire straits in which the Reformer and his followers were placed. Some thought the situation hopeless, but Alexander, Earl of Glencairn, stepped forward and said: 'Let every man serve his conscience. I will, by God's grace, see my brethren in St Johnstone; yea, although never a man should accompany me, I will go, if it were but with a pike on my shoulder; for I had rather die with that company than live after them.' These brave words had the effect of raising twelve hundred mounted men, with as many more on foot, and nothing would stop that gallant band—no tabard-clad heralds of the Queen at Glasgow, no bridges broken down at Forth and Teith, no steep mountain ascents and descents—till by forced marches they reached Perth, and relieved Knox and his sore pressed company. The Queen, in fact, had now to treat with the besieged on their own terms. The earl's brother, Andrew Cunningham, was also an ardent Protestant, and would have been done to death by Cardinal Beaton had he not managed to escape from prison.

After remaining a year or so with the Glencairn family—doubtless a happy and helpful period for him—Spottiswood was given an important piece of work, on the earl's suggestion, which necessitated his return to England for a short time. This was the carrying out of the proposed marriage between Lady Margaret Douglas, niece of Henry VIII., and Matthew, Earl of Lennox. The young lady, brought up at the English Court, was daughter of that Margaret, Henry's sister, who was the Queen of James IV. of Scotland, and,

after his death, wife of Archibald Douglas, Earl of Angus. Her father having referred the matter to the English King, the Earl of Lennox was desirous of having suitable persons to act for him at the Court of England, and the Earl of Glencairn, as we have stated, recommended Mr John Spottiswood as one likely to manage the affair well. The latter accordingly went to England for the purpose, his mission was entirely successful, and the marriage took place in the summer of 1544. He remained with the Earl of Lennox for some time after the nuptials, and then came back to his native country with the resolve not to leave it again. One wonders what John Spottiswood thought in after days of this episode in his career, for tragedy, or rather a series of tragedies, resulted from it, so far as the high contracting parties were concerned. The first-born of the Earl and Countess of Lennox was no less a personage than Henry, Lord Darnley, who became the ill-fated husband of the ill-fated Queen Mary, and was foully murdered at the Kirk o' Field, Edinburgh, while his father became the luckless Regent of the Kingdom and was slain in the streets of Stirling.

On his return to Scotland, Spottiswood found a new friend who, like the Earl of Glencairn, was in many ways helpful to him. This was Sir James Sandilands, Lord St John, afterwards first Lord Torphichen. A reformer himself, he was brother of that other zealous reformer, Sir John Sandilands, the Knight of Calder. Sir James was no unimportant man in the Kingdom. He it was who had been sent to France to lay the Acts of the Scottish Parliament before Francis and Mary and obtain the royal assent needful to give them the force of statute law. The mission, alas! was in vain—'the Guisians rebuked him sharply,' says Calderwood—and Sir James came back to tell of the coldness with which



the gay French Court had received him. With these two brothers, and also with a close friend of theirs the Lord James Stewart (afterwards Earl of Moray), John Spottiswood became very intimate. In 1547 he was presented by Sir James Sandilands to the parish of Calder—then Calder-Comitis—now divided into the parishes of Mid-Calder and West Calder. This being technically a Romish appointment—and made thirteen years prior to the statutory recognition or establishment of the Protestant Church in Scotland—John Spottiswood may be said to be the only one of the six Johns who was priest or minister of the same parish both in its Romish and Protestant days. He is now taken away from his native Border district, and also from the Glencairn country in the west, and located in Mid-Lothian, or the Lothians, in which part of Scotland his life's work is henceforth mainly to be done.

We can picture him as minister at Calder. The Book of the Baronage of Scotland says that Mr Spottiswood took great pains in teaching his people the principles of the Protestant faith. We cannot fancy him otherwise than as a diligent and faithful pastor. There must have been a priest's house, parsonage or manse, but it appears from several references to him that he resided a good deal at Calder House, an ancient abode with iron-barred windows, rush-strewn floors, and great cavern fireplaces. There he met many eminent Scotsmen, among them the Earl of Argyll, the Earl of Mar, and, as already stated, the Lord James Stewart. George Buchanan had been for some time tutor to the last named, but Spottiswood also appears to have occupied that office, and the Lord James held him in such regard that in 1558, when appointed one of the Commissioners to visit France in order to witness his sister's marriage to the Dauphin, he selected his old tutor to accompany

him. More than once there came to Calder House John Knox, and he dispensed the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in the old mansion. Spottiswood doubtless on these occasions would meet the great church leader, and we can well fancy how mutually enjoyable and profitable the conversation of two such men would be. The minister was frequently absent from his parish—to the distress of the parishioners—in connection with his duties as Superintendent, but of these absences we shall speak again. We know what the minister of Calder's stipend was, for in the year 1574 it is put down as: 'LXVIIJ  $\text{L}$ I, VIIJS, IX $\frac{1}{3}$ d, with the third of his own Personage, extending to IJ bollis beir and VIIJ $\frac{2}{3}$  bollis aitis.'

As we have seen, he was elected and admitted Superintendent of the Lothians in 1560. The sphere of his jurisdiction included a good deal more than that section of the lowlands—Tweeddale, for instance, came under his oversight—and the work was arduous. He would have to 'plant kirks,' and provide ministers and readers. He was not at liberty to remain in any one place more than twenty days till he had passed through his entire bounds. He had to preach at least thrice weekly, both when travelling and when at his principal station, where he must not stay longer than three or four months at a time. More than once Spottiswood asked the Assembly to relieve him of the office, but such relief was not granted, and John Spottiswood continued Superintendent till his death. The Calder people objected strongly to his holding the double office, and approached the General Assembly on more occasions than one to let them have their minister to themselves. They said, moreover, that he had been appointed to the Superintendency without their having been consulted in the matter, and it was 'impossible' they urged, 'for

one man to brook and exercise two offices without one or other being neglected; otherwise we should differ little from the popish Kirk where one person had plurality of benefices.' The Assembly, however, refused the complaint of the parishioners, maintained that Superintendents were necessary owing to the scarcity of ministers, and that 'the profit of many churches was to be preferred to the profit of one.' Until the erection of Presbyteries the Superintendents seem to have moderated in the Synods, and they reported to the Assembly on matters coming from the Synods. Accordingly we find in 1573 Spottiswood giving in some articles in the name of the Synod to the Assembly, but he signs simply as one of the ministers within the bounds, the signatures of the other ministers being appended also, and John Spottiswood's appears twelfth on the list. Some years later we find among the Synod articles one craving 'the Assembly to take order with Mr John Spotswood for selling the tack of this benefice without consent of the Assembly,' but, as by that time, presbyteries were erected the matter was remitted to the presbytery of the bounds.

John Spottiswood was one of those appointed to draw up the *Confession of Faith* and the *First Book of Discipline*, but, as these important documents, and their composition, have already been referred to, they need not delay us further here. We have testimony to his qualifications for such work from Quintin Kennedy who, in his *Compendious Ressonying* in support of the Mass, says that Spottiswood was profoundly 'learnit in the mysteries of the New Testament.'

It is interesting to note that our Reformer had several interviews with Queen Mary. In the beginning of the year 1565, letters were received from the ministers of Kyle informing their brethren in Edinburgh and

elsewhere that the old church was becoming active again, and that its priests intended to celebrate Mass at Easter. These letters had a great effect on the brethren and caused them to draw up a supplication praying Her Majesty to 'take heid' of such designs. The supplication or complaint was sent at the hands of the Superintendents of Lothian and Glasgow to the Secretary of State, who duly replied, in the Queen's name, that 'thare suld be such provision made as suld serve their contentment.' Evidently Spottiswood and his fellow Superintendent had no personal interview with the sovereign on that occasion. He, however, was in the royal presence on the occasion—May 1565—already referred to in previous chapters when Willock and Winram were also there, and the Queen 'cherished the Superintendents with faire words.' In October of the same year Spottiswood was sent to the Queen on another matter. He was accompanied by Mr David Lindsay, minister at Leith. They had with them a supplication from the ministers within the Superintendency of the Lothians, praying for payment of their stipends out of the thirds of the benefices as resolved upon by the Privy Council. What came of this we are not told, but in the following year, just before the meeting of the General Assembly in June, the Superintendents 'with the uther ministeris of the Kirkes' drew up another supplication of similar import which was presented to the Queen in Edinburgh Castle by John Spottiswood and John Craig, and was 'graciously received,' though it was some six months before the promised relief came of 'certain victuallis and monie.' Shortly after this, Spottiswood was again in the royal presence on a somewhat similar errand, to which reference has already been made in the lives of Winram and Row. In December 1566 the General

Assembly 'appointed the Bishop of Galloway, Mr Spotswood, and others, to repair to Stirling and to solicit the extract of said assignation from the Comptroller and Clerk-Register that letters may be raised thereupon.' The commissioners did so, saw the Queen, and at her hand 'obtained their demands in an ample manner.' Row, as we have seen, was also present on that occasion.

But the most interesting and most memorable of Spottiswood's interviews with Queen Mary was the following. When her son Prince James was born in 1566, the General Assembly deputed him to convey their congratulations to Her Majesty, and at the same time to express the desire of the Assembly that the child be 'baptized according to the form used in the Reformed Church.' The desire was not granted, but a little scene in the royal apartment, when the infant prince was presented, is prettily told by the Archbishop, the Superintendent's son. It is a delightful anecdote and was evidently cherished by the Spottiswood family. 'The Queen calling to bring the infant, gave him into his arms; and he falling upon his knees and conceiving a short and pithy prayer was very attentively heard by her. The Superintendent upon the close of his prayer spake to the babe and willed him to say AMEN for himself, which she took in so good a part, as continually after she called him the Superintendent her AMEN. The story having been told to the prince when he came to years of understanding, he also called him after the same manner, and whilst he lived did respect and reverence him as his spiritual father.' In the following year, Spottiswood, assisted by the Superintendent of Angus and the Bishop of Orkney, officiated at the coronation of the young King at Stirling, placing the crown on his head.

About this time the General Assembly (1567) gave



him a somewhat delicate piece of work to do, and that was the censuring of the Countess of Argyll for giving her countenance to Prince James's baptism according to the Romish manner. Here is how the matter appears in the Assembly minutes: 'The Countess of Argyle compearing, acknowledged that she had offended God and slaundered the Kirk, by assisting the baptisme of the King in Papisticall manner with her presence. The Assemblie ordeaned her to make her publict repentance in the Chapelle Royale of Stirline, in time of sermoun, as the Assemblie sall appoint the Superintendent of Lothiane.'

Spottiswood was frequently employed by the Supreme Court of the Church for special work. He was one of those appointed, for instance, to revise the Form and Order of Excommunication, and also to revise the Acts of Assembly. As a side-light on those times—and also as showing the Assembly's strict regard for Church institutions and ordinances—one 'John Flint, vicar, pensioner of Ayton, was summoned to compeare (before the General Assembly of 1570) for abusing the Sacraments; compeared, and was ordeaned to abstain from all functions within the Kirk till the Superintendent of Lothiane trie his abilitie and learning.' Indeed we may say that as Superintendent of Lothian and Tweeddale—a most important part of Scotland, including as it did the capital—Spottiswood played no small part in the ecclesiastical affairs of the time. One would have expected to see his name in the list of Moderators of the Assembly, but that high office did not fall to him. Scarcely a leader himself, he was rather the representative of other leaders, and more particularly of the greatest leader of them all, John Knox.

After Queen Mary escaped from Lochleven—with hopes revived for a little at Hamilton and then shortly after dashed to the ground at Langside—we find John

Spottiswood writing a letter on public affairs which seems unusually strong and uncharitable for such a man. He does not mince his words with regard to Mary's conduct, and holds that she should have been executed for her crimes. Some believe that, though the letter is published under his name, its composition is that of some one else. Calderwood even says that 'the letter must have been penned by Mr Knox as appeareth by the style.' While that may be the case—though we do not think the letter is quite of the Knoxian style—it should not be forgotten that Spottiswood had special regard for the Earl of Lennox and the Earl of Moray. The latter now led the party opposed to the Queen, and the former, father of the murdered Darnley, was Spottiswood's old friend, and the treatment of the Lennox family by Mary may have roused Spottiswood's wrath against her. Moreover, from these two earls he may have had special information regarding the Queen's doings. He was one of the Commissioners appointed by the Assembly to meet the Regent Moray's Commissioners on all important matters relating to the Church. That the letter was considered of great importance we gather from this fact, among others, that in 'in the next Session of that same Assembly it was concluded that the Letter directed to the Lords who have made desertion from the King's Majesty—after it is returned from the Regent's Grace—shall be registrate among the Acts of the Kirk, and that it be printed.' Though for the Lords in particular, it was for the whole nation. As was to be expected Archbishop Spottiswood is silent with regard to this document, for it would never have done that posterity—and more particularly members of the royal house—should read the terrible indictment by his father of Queen Mary, whose son James VI. is styled 'of blessed

memory' and whose grandson Charlés I. is styled a 'most religious and blessed prince and martyr' by the 'grave and reverend prelate and wise Counsellor Lord Archbishop of St Andrews and Privy Counsellor'—all of which stands conspicuous on the title-page of Spottiswood's History. The letter, then, is not printed there, but Bishop Keith gives it a place in his History, from which we now transcribe it, premising that there were evidently two letters or admonitions, the following being that which was penned before the battle of Langside was fought, and when the Queen was at Hamilton gathering her forces.

'Mr John Spotswood, Superintendent of Louthian, to all that profess or that have professed the Lord Jesus, and have refused that Roman Antichrist called the Pope, within the Diocese committed to his charge, desires grace, mercie and peace, from God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, together with the Spirit of righteous judgment :

'That fearful sentence pronounced be God Himself unto His Prophet Ezekiel, against the watchman that seeth the sword coming, and doeth not blow the trumpet and plainly warn the people, compelleth me to write unto you, beloved in the Lord, this my rude letter, because that my corporal presence and weak voice cannot be extended to you all in thir dangerous and most wicked dayes. To you, I say, I am compelled to cry be my pen, that the sword of God's just judgment is come, and hath devoured some, according to the forewarning of his messengers, and alace, I fear is yet drawn, and yet ready to devour more ; the first part of this cannot be denied, and the second also hath great probabilities, and yet I fear that every man seeth not, or at least will not confess the very cause neither of the one nor yet of the other. We see a wicked woman, whose iniquity known and lawfully convict deserved more than ten deaths, escaped from prison,

this is the *first* ; negligence of the keepers of it is not to be excused, so may it well occupy the *second* place before men ; practices of deceitfull men together with her own villanie, justly may cocupy the *third* rank in that wicked fact ; but none of all these should have had place to work if the mouth of the Lord had been obeyed, for if she had suffered according as God's law commandeth "murderers and adulterers to die the death," the wickedness taken forth from Israel, the plague should have ceased, which cannot but remain, so long as that innocent blood traterously shed is not punished according as God hath commanded ; and so I fear not to affirm that the reservation of that wicked woman, against God and against the voices of His servants, is the first and principall cause externall which man can see of the plague and murder lately begun. And yet, when I confess it to be the first externall cause, I mean not that it is the only and sole cause of this present and appearing calamity ; for albeit that the devil himself had been loosed (as no doubt he was) in the person of that most wicked woman, yet could not he and she greatly have troubled this Commonwealth, unless that she had been assisted with the presence, counsell, and force of such as have professed the Lord Jesus, and be all appearance had renounced that Roman Antichrist and his damnable superstition. For albeit all the Papists within the Realm of Scotland had joyned with her, the danger had not been great, for although in number the wicked might have exceeded the faithfull, yet when the servants of God should have had battle only against the Canaanites, Jebusites, Amorites, and against the rest of that prophane and adulterous generation, they could no more have feared now, than that the little flock hath feared from the beginning of this controversie which now, be God's

power, this nine years they have sustained against all the pestilent Papists within the same. But alace ! the sword of dolour hath pierced, and yet pierceth, many hearts to see brethren seek with cruelty the blood of their brethren, yea to see the hands of such as were esteemed the principall within the flock, to arm themselves against God, against His Son Christ Jesus, against a just and most lawful authority, and against the men who asked of them not only quietness and peace, but also maintenance and defence against all invasion, domesticall and forraign. The consideration of this their most treasonable defection from God, from his truth professed, and from the authority most lawfully established, causeth the hearts of many godlie to sob and moan, not only secretly, but also openly to crave of God the conversion and repentance of such as have assisted that most wicked woman who ambitiously, cruelly, and most unjustly hath aspired, and yet aspireth, to that regiment wherefrom, for impieties committed, mostly justly and be such order as no law can reprove, she was deposed. And therefore, in the bowels of Christ Jesus, I exhort all in general and such as are under my charge in speciall, who hath communicated with her odious impieties, that they deeply consider their fearfull defection from God, and from His lawfull magistrates be His Word and be good order, erected within this Realm and that they be the condemnation and publict confession of their folly travel speedily to return again to the bosom of the Kirk and unto the obedience due unto Magistrates, from which they have most traitorously declined ; assuring such as shall be apprehended to remain obstinat in their former wicked enterprise, that in our next letters their names shall be expressed and proclaimed before all congregations wherewith, if they be not moved to



repentance, then will we (albeit with grief of heart) be counselled to draw the sword committed to us by God, and to cut them off from all societie of the body of Jesus Christ, and for their stubborn rebellion to give them to the power of Satan, to the destruction of the flesh, that they, confounded in themselves, be unfained repentance may return again from their wicked ways, and so escape condemnation in the day of the Lord Jesus, Whose omnipotent Spirit move the hearts of all that look for the life everlasting to consider that His coming approacheth. AMEN. Given at Calder.'

At this time—connected more or less with the above letter—a matter of national importance was taking place in which we find our Reformer bearing a conspicuous part. The Earl of Arran, better known, perhaps, as the Duke of Châtellherault, had returned from France, and with him a good deal of mischief in the making. He had particular dislike for the Earl of Moray, now Regent, and tried to circumvent him. But that able Governor kept his vigilant eye on him, and so, too, did John Knox. The Duke had come back with a large sum of money contributed by the Roman Catholic princes, and, on his homeward journey, he had secured an interview with the captive Queen in England, who gave him full commission to act as her lieutenant in Scotland. Arrived at Hamilton, he proceeded to carry out his plans and, among other things, wrote a letter to the General Assembly in which he stated that the troubles in his native land had brought him from France ; that he was a wronged man, but that the public good overrode private grievances ; that he would do all in his power to help his country ; that he wished to help the Reformed Church to carry on its work ; that he was concerned about the Earl of Moray's attitude towards him ; that he desired the Assembly to

make known to the people the purport of his letter ; and that he was quite willing to receive and confer with any ministers on these matters. He subscribes himself ‘ Your Christian Brother, James Hamiltoun.’ The Assembly took the matter into their consideration, and having consulted with the Earl of Moray, deputed three of their number, namely, Mr John Spottiswood, Superintendent of Lothian ; Mr John Winram, Superintendent of Fife ; and Mr John Row, minister of Perth, to proceed to Hamilton and confer with the Duke. The result was somewhat singular, for instead of the pope converting them, they converted the pope, their arguments with the Duke being so effective that he changed his attitude towards the Regent’s Government, and peace reigned in the Kingdom—not that the Hamilton faction was satisfied, for they had something like a blood-feud with the Earl of Moray ; what they could not do openly they did by secret and foul means ; and by the murderous hand of Hamilton of Bothwellhaugh they struck down the good Regent in the streets of Linlithgow.

In the year 1570 we find Spottiswood, at the instance of Knox, sent by the Kirk-Session of Edinburgh to the Castle to tell Kirkcaldy of Grange, who held that fortress for the Queen, of his ‘ offence against God ’ in taking up the attitude he now did. So Bannatyne in his *Memorials* informs us. Spottiswood seems to have acted as Moderator of the Session in connection with Kirkcaldy’s ‘ complaint ’ against Knox, which ‘ complaint ’ or charge stirred the righteous wrath of the latter, and caused him to say to Spottiswood, ‘ Superintendent, I pray you (for the matter chiefly toucheth you) be faithful and stout in your office.’ We have no record as to how the Superintendent bore himself on the occasion, but we can scarcely fancy that it would be otherwise than in a ‘ faithful ’ and ‘ stout ’ manner, with the indomitable Knox at his very elbow.

We learn from the *Book of the Universal Kirk* that Spottiswood had more than one interview with the Regent Morton on matters pertaining to the Church. From the pages of that Book, too, we learn that, as with the other Superintendents, he was several times 'dilated' for 'slackness' in the performance of his duties. But the work was arduous and expensive. He tells the Assembly of the 'pains and travells tane be him these fourteen years bygane in over-seeing and visiting of the Kirks from Stirling to Berwick'—verily a large diocese, or, as it is called in the Book, 'Diocy,' as also 'Superintendency.' He, with his Consistory or Session, would have to judge in cases of defamation. He had also to hand over criminals to the civil magistrate, for he complains that 'diverse times he had exhibite to the Justice clerk the names of haynous offenders, but could find no execution.' He also mentions dealings he had with the Procurator-Fiscal. The 'reparation of Kirks' gave him great trouble. More than once he goes on 'visitation free and upon his own charges.' Indeed, he says that 'he had visited in his own charges now these nyne years.' He had the greatest difficulty in getting his arrears of stipend, but at last on 16th December 1580 he obtained £45, 9s. 6d., and some chalders of grain for three years, and this 'pension'<sup>1</sup> was renewed on 26th November 1583 for five years. Owing to his growing infirmities—though he retained the office of Superintendent till his death—Mr David Lindsay, minister at Leith, and Mr Lawson, minister at Edinburgh, were appointed to 'support and aid Mr John' In his old age his son, afterwards the Archbishop, was appointed his colleague and successor at Calder at the remarkably early age of eighteen, which easily beats the record of Thomas Chalmers, and, indeed,

<sup>1</sup> See Note 2.

we suppose of all other youths of 'pregnant pairts,' or 'early pairts,' ordained to the holy ministry in the Scottish Church.

Spottiswood was a member of the fateful convention which met at Leith in 1572. At the Assembly held in April 1576<sup>1</sup> a complaint was made against him of having inaugurated the Bishop of Ross in the Abbey of Holyrood House. He admitted his fault, and the Assembly proceeded no further in the matter. The position of Bishops at that time was really peculiar, and gave rise to curious situations and discussions. They were so far allowed by the Assembly, but they had no other functions than those which pertained to Superintendents, even if they had these. In all things they were accountable to the General Assembly. This Bishop of Ross, Alexander Hepburn, it seems, should have been inaugurated not at Edinburgh, but in the principal church of the diocese of Ross. The Superintendent of Lothian also took some small part in the inauguration of the first *tulchan* Archbishop, John Douglas, at St Andrews.<sup>2</sup> As a member of the Assembly Spottiswood was one of those who protested against the titles of archbishop, deans, and the like, and against designations such as chapters. It was he, indeed, who struck a strong blow at the civil power and place of bishops, which was always considered by them among their dearest privileges. Was it not this very John Spottiswood who moved and carried in the General

<sup>1</sup> In this book sometimes the dates are given in the old style and sometimes in the new. With regard to one of the Assemblies John Row, the historian, says: 'Conveened at Edinburgh, February 25, 1568 (for the yeare then begouth not till March 25, for so is it yit in England to this day, and the change was not till 1600, at whilk tyme Jame VI., by an Act of Councill, ordained the supputation of the beginning of the yeare to be from Januar 1).'

<sup>2</sup> See Note 3.

Assembly of 1573, 'that it was neither agreeable to the Word of God, nor to the practice of the primitive church, for one man to occupy the charges of a minister of the Gospel and of a civil and criminal judge'—a sentiment to which the ambitious clerico-secular career of his prelatie son offers a most glaring contradiction ?

We have noticed only one reference to the Reformer in the Register of the Privy Council, but it is interesting as throwing some light on his duties as Superintendent, and as indicating that there were then some turbulent spirits in the realm. It is in the year 1573, when we find Spottiswood complaining to 'my Lord Regent's Grace and Lords of the Secret Counsell,' that when the minister of Kirkliston had a certain piece of ground allocated to him for manse and glebe, and the said ground was being measured out, Lord Seton appeared on the scene accompanied by a band of servants 'with culveringis and utheris wappynis,' and declared that the land was his and on no account would he allow the minister to have it. The Privy Council, finding that the allocation of the ground had been quite legal, decided in favour of Spottiswood, and ordered Lord Seton to be 'put to the horn' (outlawed) if he interfered further in the matter.

John Spottiswood died on 5th December 1585, in the seventy-sixth year of his age. Here it may be stated that all 'the six Johns'—with the exception perhaps of John Douglas—were married. They had been priests or friars before the Reformation, and the five who married showed by personal example, like Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli, the new and better views on marriage which were now being held. Theoretically the Church of Rome held a high view on the subject, and death alone was able to dissolve the marriage union ; but that Church, by its canon law which extended the Levitical prohibitions, could declare that



certain so-called marriages were null from the beginning. Consequently, since bishops and other dignitaries had so frequently dissolved the marriage tie, the *First Book of Discipline* found it necessary to restore to its proper standing this 'blessed ordinance of God,' as it puts it, which had been so degraded and weakened that persons united in matrimony could never be sure if they could continue therein. And Parliament in 1567 confirmed by statute the contentions of the reformers. The marriage rite and tie thus became more rational as well as scriptural. The celibacy of the clergy, moreover, was entirely repudiated. John Spottiswood by his wife, Beatrix, daughter of Patrick Crichton of Lugton and Gilmerton, had three sons and two daughters. The sons were John, his successor at Calder, who became the Archbishop; James, who became Bishop of Clogher in Ireland, and subsequently was nominated to the Archiepiscopal see of Cashel, upon the duties of which, however, he never entered;<sup>1</sup> and William. The daughters were Rachel, who was married to James Tennent of Linhouse; and Judith. According to Scott's *Fasti*, at his death 'the utensils of his house, etc., were estimat at XL℥i; the Frie Geir, ættis deducit, amounted to iiiij<sup>c</sup> LXiii℥i, XIIJs. iiijd. He left to the poor of the parish of Calder XX merkis, and giffs to Johne Spotswood in Blakisling and his bairns, X℥i of that in the hands of Johne Gude-fellow, minister of Longforgan, for his help at the schulis. Ninian Spotswood of that ilk was left oversman.'

The Archbishop pays this filial tribute: 'Chosen Superintendent of the Churches of Lothian, Merse, and Teviotdale, by the space of twenty [twenty-five] years he governed them most wisely. His care in teaching, planting of churches, reducing people and persons of all sorts into the right way, was great, and so successful,

<sup>1</sup> See Note 4.

as within the bounds of his charge none were found refractory from the religion professed. . . . He was a man well esteemed for his piety and wisdom, loving, and beloved of all persons, charitable to the poor and careful above all things to give no man offence. His happy life was crowned with a blessed death.'

We have omitted here the sentences already quoted, at the beginning of this chapter, with regard to the supposed leanings of John Spottiswood, *primus*, towards Episcopacy. The Archbishop, however, further says that, 'two years before his death as many then alive could witness,' his father spoke in depreciation of the system set up by Knox. He even says that among his utterances was the following: 'the doctrine we profess is good, but the old policy was undoubtedly better; God is my witness, I lie not.' But the Archbishop is the only writer of those times who imputes such views to him. The aged minister of Calder may have been annoyed at the extravagances of some of the Presbyterian ministers, and he may have said that they would be all the better of a bishop to keep them in order, or something to that effect, just as a Presbyterian minister to-day might make, jocularly or sarcastically, a similar observation with regard to some ministers he would like to see muzzled; or even as an Anglican prelate, harassed by some refractory rector or vicar, might, over the walnuts and the wine, express his admiration for, and envy of, the disciplinary powers of a Scottish presbytery or kirk-session. Was it not natural, too, for the Archbishop to endeavour to have his father on his side, so far as possible? Wodrow says on this point: 'We could scarce expect but that the Bishop would stretch himself to the utmost to bring his parent, who was directly opposite to him in his whole practice through his life, to come as near him ere he dyed

as might be ' ; and he adds that (so many changes having been introduced—some by the civil power on an unwilling church—with resultant ill-feeling and disorder, and all perhaps to the grief of the Superintendent) even if ' we take it on his son's word, he seems to have been much confined to his house when it may be things were misrepresented to the old man.' The air of the sickroom is certainly depressing, and when the candle of life is burning low—heart and flesh failing—what is less noble in a man may emerge and yield to sinister influences around. Who guarded the dying hours of the Emperor Charles V. ? The Monks of San Yuste, and they declared that he said certain things regarding his word of honour to Martin Luther which—if he did say them—were ignoble, and would not have been uttered by him in the days of his strength, unsurrounded by influences such as those which affected him in that Spanish convent. Perhaps, says an historian, his confessor may have thrust into his lips the words which he so wished to hear. But, as already stated, no other writer of those times has ever hinted that John Spottiswood changed, or was changing, his views on church polity. All references to him, outside of his son's book, point to his having acted to the very close of his life in obedience to, and in sympathy with, the constitution of the Presbyterian Church which he had so large a part in framing. He was a regular attender of the meetings of the General Assembly, was employed on many of its important committees and commissions, and as a diligent member thereof did his part in strengthening and consolidating the Presbyterian Church of Scotland.

## APPENDIX

## NOTE 1

## SPOTTISWOOD AT GLASGOW UNIVERSITY

The following, from Wodrow's *Collections* (vol. i. p. 445), we noticed after this chapter was written :—

' 1534. Incorporat die Sabbatj XXXIj, etc. Dns. Jo<sup>es</sup> Spottiswood Sv<sup>us</sup> (*i.e.* servus) dnj Rectoris.

' 1535. Feb. 8 Dnu Joannes Spottiswood proceeded Bachelor.

' 1536. M<sup>gr</sup> Jo<sup>es</sup> Spottiswood is chosen one of the *intrantes deputati* Rectoris.

' 1543. Joha<sup>nes</sup> Spottiswood is again elected as above (Ann. Univ. et Fac. Art.—Records, Nos. 1 and 2).'

This would almost indicate that Spottiswood must have entered the University of Glasgow before the year 1534. Twenty-four is certainly an unusual age for a student of that time to matriculate, and possibly the words mean that when he was approaching the end of his career as a student, he received an appointment on the staff of the University, namely, as servant of the Rector. He may have had to look after refractory students in the 'carcer' and drag away offenders to that establishment. A student could scarcely have been able to take a degree in the course of a few months. That he was a bachelor in 1535 and a master in 1536 is not to be wondered at, because in all likelihood promotion from bachelorship to mastership in Glasgow University in those times depended, as it has done in other universities in much later days, not on proof of higher scholarship, but merely on payment of an extra fee. We understand the entry under the year 1636 to mean that Spottiswood then received an appointment corresponding to that of proctor at Oxford nowadays, that is to say, he had to look after the behaviour and morals of the students. From 'intrantes' we infer that the Glasgow proctors of those days had the right to enter the students' lodgings.

Spottiswood, of course, was not at the University all the time from 1534 till 1543, for, as we have seen in the biography, he left Glasgow for England in or about the year 1539. He returned, however, to Scotland in 1543, and, as he was not ordained at Calder till 1547, it is possible that he attended classes again at Glasgow.

## NOTE 2

## SPOTTISWOOD'S PENSION, ETC.

' Oure Souverane Lord, Understanding the gude and thankfull service done to his hienes and his predicessouris be his louit Mr

Johne Spottiswood, persoun of Calder, Ordanis ane letter to be maid vnder the privie sele in deu frome to the said Mr Johne Spottiswood, and efter his deceis to James Spottiswood his lauful sone, off the gift of ane zerlie pension of sevin chalderis five bollis twa pekis meill, ffoure bollis twa p<sup>t</sup>. boll quheit, and fortie five pund nyne schillingis sex pennynis money zeirlie, to be vplifit and uptane be the said Mr Johne and eftir his deceis be the said James, thair factouris and servitouris in thair names, off the reddiest of the fructis, mailles, teindis, proffeittis rentes and emolumentis of the abbacy of Deir, at twa termes in the zeir, Witsunday and Mertimes in winter be equall portiounis, for all the dayis, space and termes of thre zeiris efter the said Mr Johnnis entres thairto, Qlk is [wes] at the feast of Witsunday last bipast, and of the crop and zeir of God JMV<sup>c</sup> fourscore zeiris instant, and for the maist sure payment to be maid to the said Mr Johnne and eftir his deceis to the said James of the said pension during the said space, hes assignit and be the tennor heirop assignis and disponis to thame the saidis four bollis 2 p<sup>t</sup>. boll quheit to be tane furt zeirlie of the manis of Deir, of the teindis and fermes thairof, and the saidis seven chalderis five bollis ij p<sup>c</sup>is 2 p<sup>c</sup> meill to be uptane zeirlie of the readiest of the ferme meill and teind meill of the parochin of Deir, and the said sowme of fourtie five pundis IXs. vjd. off the readiest of the thrid of the money of the said abbacy of the said termes ; With power to the said Mr Johnne, and eftir his deceis to the said James, To call and persew for the saidis victuallis and money assignit to thame, as said is, at said termes, acquittances and dischargis vpon the ressait thairof to gif in all or in p<sup>t</sup> salba alsufficient as gif the samin wer gevin be the laufallie providit commendator thairof ; And the said Letter be extendit, etc., with command to the Lordis of Session to grant letteris, etc., Subscrivit at Haliruidhous the XVJ day of December 1580.'  
—Register of Presentations of Benefices, II. f. 43.

But pension or no pension, arrears of stipend paid or unpaid, John Spottiswood does not appear to have been a poor man, for according to Sir Daniel Wilson, LL.D., in his *Memorials of Edinburgh in the Olden Time*, he was the owner of a substantial and commodious house—one of the best indeed—in the High Street of Edinburgh. It was well known for many years as 'the Bishop's Land' (hence to-day Bishop's Close), it having been the residence of Archbishop Spottiswood ; but, as appears from the title deeds, the prelate inherited it from his father, the Superintendent of Lothian. The date on the edifice was 1578, at



which time John Spottiswood would be in the sixty-ninth year of his age. The ground floor of the building was formed of a deeply-arched piazza, supported by massive stone piers, and over the main entrance a carved lintel bore the inscription, BLISSIT . BE . YE . LORD . FOR . ALL . HIS . GIFTIS, with a shield impaled with two coats of arms. A fine brass balcony projected from the first floor which, decorated with gay hangings, would, doubtless, be crowded at times with fair and noble spectators to witness the Riding of the Parliament and other state pageants. In later days the Bishop's Land is understood to have been the residence of the first Lord President Dundas and the birthplace of the well-known Viscount Melville. Lady Jane Douglas, of the famous Douglas cause, also resided in this mansion. The interesting old building was totally destroyed by fire in 1814. Even as late as the end of the eighteenth century, it was an aristocratic abode, its occupants having their liveried servants.

The Spottiswood mansion was bounded on the east by the house of James Henderson of Fordel. Though historians generally say that Queen Mary, after her surrender at Carberry Hill, was lodged in the house of the Provost, Sir Simon Preston, the *Diurnal of Occurrents* indicates that it was to Henderson's house she was taken. If the *Diurnal* be correct, and the Superintendent of Lothian owned his Edinburgh house, and was in residence, at the time, he had unequalled opportunity for seeing the poor Queen, her fair face soiled with dust and tears, riding up the street to her temporary prison-house, with the insulting shouts of the infuriated populace ringing in her ears.

## NOTE 3

## SPOTTISWOOD AND THE TULCHANS

'Not one of our Superintendents would be Tulchan Bishop, though I doubt not Mr Spotswood and the Laird of Dun might have been made the two Tulchan Archbishops, if they had pleased, bot they wer both better men than to truckle into a nominal office, to serve designs of the Court, and wer both in their principle against prelacy in the church,' etc.

Wodrow in his *Collections*.

## NOTE 4

## JAMES SPOTTISWOOD

The life-story of John, the eldest son, being well-known, need not be given here, but it may be well to give some informa-

tion about the Superintendent's second son, James, who rose to be a man of some distinction. His education began at home under a tutor, was continued at the Grammar School of Linlithgow, and was completed at Glasgow University where he graduated M.A. He accompanied James VI. as gentleman-usher on his voyage to Denmark for his bride the Princess Anne, and some ten years later he again went abroad as Secretary to the Ambassadors to the King of Denmark and the German princes. Following his sovereign to England, he entered Anglican orders, and was presented by James to the rectory of Wells, Norfolk. For sixteen years he tended carefully his parish, refusing to attend Court, but in that time he visited as a commissioner of reform the University of St Andrews, where he obtained the degree of D.D. In 1621 he became Bishop of Clogher, and it is said that some years later he had the refusal of the Archbishopric of St Andrews, which was then conferred on his brother John. He was appointed Archbishop of Cashel, but he does not appear to have entered on the office. He fled from Ireland on the outbreak of the rebellion in 1641, died in London in 1644 or 1646, and was buried in Westminster Abbey beside his brother, the Scottish Archbishop. He left a son, Sir Henry Spottiswood, and a daughter Mary who, through marriage with Abraham Crichton, became ancestress of the Earls of Erne.

(See *Dictionary of National Biography*, and the authorities cited there.)

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Histories of Knox, Row, Calderwood, Spottiswood, and Keith.  
*Memoriales of Richard Bannatyne.*

*Diurnal of Occurrents.*

Wodrow's *Collections.*

James Scott's *History of the Lives of Protestant Reformers in Scotland.*

Hew Scott's *Fasti.*

M'Crie's *Knox.*

M'Crie's *Melville.*

Lee's *Lectures on the History of the Church of Scotland.*

Grub's *Ecclesiastical History of Scotland.*

*Dictionary of National Biography.* Article, 'John Spottiswood.'

*Register of the Privy Council of Scotland.*

## CHAPTER VII

### JOHN DOUGLAS

PRINCIPAL LEE, in his *Lectures on the History of the Church of Scotland*, says that all the accounts of John Douglas which he has ever seen in modern histories abound with errors, and he goes on to state that some have represented him as having been an obscure Carmelite friar whom the Earl of Argyll chose to employ as his chaplain, and for whom the Archbishop of St Andrews expressed the strongest aversion; whereas, says the Principal, he was quite a different man, belonged to a good family, was the son of Sir George Douglas of Pinkie, in all likelihood was related to James Douglas, Earl of Morton, and, like him, would be connected with the great family of Angus. But the learned Principal of Edinburgh University is himself in error here. Dr David Laing asserts that John Douglas was descended from the Douglasses of Pittendreich, and it is certain that the Regent Morton had possession of that place at one time, for we find him bestowing it upon one of his natural sons. Professor Mitchell of St Andrews, however, has given us his real origin. As this Professor of Church History was working one day in the Register House, Edinburgh, he found unimpeachable evidence of Douglas's parentage. This was supplied by the Register of the Privy Seal, in which there are 'letters of legitimation in favour of Mr John Douglas, Rector of the University of St Andrews, of date 2nd January 1563-64,' wherein it is

stated that he was 'bastard son naturál of quondam Robert Douglas in Langnewtone.' Where this particular Langnewtone was—the place-name and its prefix are both very common in Scotland—and whether it and the Robert Douglas 'in' it were connected with Pittendreich, it is almost impossible now to say. At one time there was a parish of Langnewton annexed to Ancrum in 1684, but we have no information as to whether John Douglas had any connection with it. A friend has suggested that he may have been the son of the priest of that parish.

It appears that there was another John Douglas connected with St Andrews when our John Douglas was there, and this would be the Douglas who had been the Carmelite or White friar, who certainly became chaplain to the Earl of Argyll, and was particularly disliked by Archbishop Hamilton. Keith and other writers have confused the two men.

John Douglas, son of Robert Douglas in Langnewtone, was born about the year 1494, was a determinant in St Leonard's College, St Andrews, in 1515, and became a licentiate in 1517. He may have lingered on at this College, as others did after laureation. Supposing that he did so, and was among the canons of the College who resolved to lodge a complaint with the King respecting the harshness and cruelty of their Superior, Archbishop Hepburn, then he must have witnessed that remarkable scene, when Hepburn, mightily enraged, rushed with a band of attendants into the sacred chapter-house to wreak his vengeance on the complainants who were assembled there. Alexander Alane (Alesius) appears to have been presiding—he and Douglas had been fellow-students—and Hepburn ordered him to be seized: yea, the prelate himself drew his sword and would have killed Alane,

had not the young man been protected by two of the canons who diverted the weapon. Hepburn, however, kicked him with almost fatal force, had him arrested, and conveyed to a filthy dungeon. Such was the measure meted out in those days to students who dared to lodge complaints against those placed over them—at least against a Superior so irascible and murderous as Patrick Hepburn, Archbishop and Prior of St Andrews. Whether this Douglas, too, was of the Carmelite order can only be left to conjecture. It has been stated that for some time he served as a priest in the diocese of Dunblane, but we are not aware on what authority the statement is based.

It was our impression that Douglas had never been out of Scotland; but, happening to glance at the *Rentale Sancti Andree* (Accounts of the Archbishopric) we noticed an entry of two lines, from which the important information emerges that Archbishop James Beaton in 1537 ordered a certain payment to be made to John Douglas who was at that time regent in Montaigu College at Paris. But when he became, or how long he continued, regent there we have not ascertained. On 1st October 1547 he was elected Provost of St Mary's College—'Prepositus Novi Collegii Mariani,' the said office being conferred 'perdocto et spectabili viro Mag<sup>ro</sup> Johanni Douglas clerico Dunkeldan dioc'—and in 1550 he became Rector of the University. To this latter office he was annually elected, and he held it for the unusually long period of twenty-three successive years.

When Douglas was installed as Rector for the first time he brought his University into connection with that of Oxford, for he had, as one of his deputed, 'Richardum Martialum verbi Dei præconem egregium.' This 'Richardus Martialis Alb. Theologus' had been 'incorporated' at St Andrews in the previous year, when Archbishop Hamilton gave him and another



Englishman, Richard Smith, a very cordial reception Richard Marshall, D.D., belonged to Christ Church College, of which he was made Dean in 1550. 'Doctor Richardus Smythæus Anglus' was also of Oxford and accounted by some the best schoolman of his time, able even to baffle Peter Martyr.

In the year 1559 Andrew Melville entered the University of St Andrews as a student. Though already of great learning, with his short stature and slender build he looked a mere boy. The Provost of St Mary's was much interested in this prodigy, and showed him marked kindness. He used to invite him to his room, take him betwixt his knees at the fireside, warm his hands and cheeks, and, blessing him, propose to him questions connected with his studies. Delighted with his demeanour and his replies, Provost Douglas exclaimed one day: 'My silly [delicate] fatherless and motherless child, it's ill to witt what God may make of thee yet.' So James Melville, the nephew of Andrew, tells us in his *Diary*. The writings of Aristotle formed then the only text book for all the 'sciences' taught within the Scottish colleges, and the lectures given by the professors or teachers were of the nature of comments on the Greek philosopher's treatises on logic, rhetoric, ethics, and physics. But the professors did not know Greek, and read and commented on them in Latin translations. Andrew Melville, however, to the astonishment of the University made use of the Greek text in his studies, of which attainment his teachers did not appear to be meanly jealous, nor did they throw any obstacles in the way of his advancement; but, on the contrary, they highly commended him for his acquaintance with that ancient language, and did all in their power to encourage such a promising youth. It may be further stated that another of the students when Douglas was at the head of the University, and a class-

fellow with Melville, was James Lawson, who became the colleague and successor of Knox in Edinburgh. It may be mentioned that St Mary's College had ampler means of instruction than either of the two other St Andrews Colleges, as it possessed separate classes for Grammar, Rhetoric, and Law, with special facilities for students of Philosophy.

Douglas, of course, would be intimate with George Buchanan, who became Principal of St Leonard's College in 1566, but earlier than that the great scholar had been in the habit of paying visits to St Andrews. There was another scholarly man with whom Douglas could not but have been on intimate terms, and that was John Winram. They had been fellow-students, were about the same age, resided for many years contemporaneously in St Andrews, lived to be very old men, and they resembled each other in type of character. It has even been said that Winram was the instrument, in the hand of God, of Douglas's conversion from popery, and, as we shall see later, it was Winram who presided at Douglas's inauguration as Archbishop. We can well fancy that these two distinguished citizens of this little city in the kingdom of Fife would frequently meet in each other's homes or by the wayside, and have much earnest converse on affairs ecclesiastical and academic. To us perhaps their themes would be uninteresting, for the controversies—and indeed many of the beliefs—of the sixteenth century are not ours to-day. As Tennyson says :—

‘ Age to age succeeds,  
Blowing a noise of tongues and deeds  
A dust of systems and of creeds.’

But these controversies, creeds, and ‘ noise of tongues and deeds,’ were matters of vast importance—indeed

of life and death—to the Douglasses, Winrams and Knoxes of that time ; and we, who followed centuries after, have benefited by their treatment and settlement of them.

A prolific writer of these latter days (a syndicate, not an individual, some have said)—whose books vary from Ballads connected with Blue China and a treatise on the Secret of the Totem, to the Life of a Victorian Parliamentarian and a History of Scotland—has in a somewhat supercilious and jeering manner referred to co-workers of John Knox. In his volume on *Historical Mysteries*, this writer, when dealing with ‘the Mystery of the Kirks,’ says that ‘one of them was a baker, and one Harlow was a tailor.’ Paul Methven, we think, was the baker, and he did much good work at first, though latterly he had a terrible lapse ; but the tailor was a man held by his contemporaries in deservedly high regard. Knox is by no means ashamed of his fellow-labourer, and gives him prominence in his History. ‘First,’ he says, ‘came a simple man, William Harlaw, whose erudition although it excel not, yet for his zeal and diligent plainness in doctrine is he to this day worthy of praise, and remains a fruitful member within the Church of Scotland [as Minister of the parish of St Cuthbert’s, Edinburgh]. . . . Our weak beginning did God so bless that within a few months the hearts of many were so strengthened that we sought to have the face of a Church among us and open crimes to be punished without respect of persons. For that purpose, by common election, were elders appointed, to whom the whole brethren promised obedience. . . . Certain zealous men, William Harlaw, and others, exhorted their brethren, according to the gifts and graces granted unto them.’<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See other references to Harlaw, p. 151.

But has our latter-day author forgotten that in Apostolic times—at the very beginning of the Church's history—it was the 'unlearned and ignorant men' who did the great things for Christ and marvellously extended his Kingdom, and that Holy Scripture says: 'God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise and . . . the weak things . . . to confound the things which are mighty, and base things and things which are despised,' and that 'not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called' for such great and holy work? Knox himself had little patience with 'political heads,' that is, mere secular statesmanship, and considered such worldly wisdom as 'mere foolishness before the Lord.' But there is another side to this. Many of the learned and of the 'mighty' *were* on the side of reform, and gave Knox great assistance. Among the latter were the highest in the land—nobles, knights, statesmen—and as for the former, surely our jeering critic—'Andrew of the brindled hair'—has forgotten that the great humanist, George Buchanan, was heart and soul with Knox, and that John Erskine of Dun—proficient in the Greek language and a far-travelled man of culture and refinement—was also similarly attached to Knox and his cause.

Then there are the 'Six Johns.' They were all endowed with scholarship and other qualities which call forth admiration and respect. Take the first and greatest of them all, John Knox himself. He was one of the 'Pope's knights,' 'a priest of the altar,' a royal chaplain, the refuser of a bishopric, a man who possessed a competent knowledge of the original languages of the Old and New Testaments, one who spoke French fluently and mixed on equal terms with the highest in the land. And let us recapitulate a few facts regard-

ing other four of them. Willock, a learned man and in orders in the Romish Church, was on friendly terms with the nobility, was tutor to Lady Jane Grey, and for many years was a Rector of the Church of England ; Winram was a Doctor of Theology, a Dean, a Sub-Prior and a Lord of the Articles ; Row was a Papal Nuncio, a Doctor of Laws of Padua and a notable linguist ; Spottiswood was of blue blood, a Romish parish priest, then a Protestant parish minister, the friend of Archbishop Cranmer and of Lords Moray, Glencairn, and Torphichen ; and Douglas—the sixth John—who, also with Romish orders, seems scarcely to have breathed anything else, for the greater part of his life, but the atmosphere of academic groves, was Professor and Provost of St Mary's College, St Andrews, and Principal of his University. It may be that in documents of the time,<sup>1</sup> and by later writers, he is not designated Professor, but as was the case with his two immediate successors, who were Principals and also Professors, he doubtless had professorial duties to perform. James Melville in his *Diary*, in alluding to Douglas's attitude towards a certain matter, refers to him and 'uther maisters and sum of the regentes.' Professor Mitchell in his *Scottish Reformation* says : 'He was a man of the ancient academic type, content to live in single blessedness and treat his pupils, who also lived in College, with the familiarity and affection of a father.' Hill Burton has put it correctly when he says in his *Scot Abroad* that 'the early Reformers and the leaders of the predominant ecclesiastical party in Scotland for a considerable period after the Reformation were eminently learned. The example of a foreign education was set to them by their political head the Regent Moray, who

<sup>1</sup> This stands to be corrected, as further on in this chapter we shall see Douglas does sign himself as a Professor.



studied at Paris under the renowned Peter Ramus.' This is very different from the impressions Andrew Lang's strictures leave on one's mind.

And what of the pioneers of Reform and sufferers for the truth, such as Patrick Hamilton, Alexander Alane (Alesius), and George Wishart? The first-named was of royal lineage, had studied at Louvain, received his degree of Master of Arts at Paris, was a Member of the Arts Faculty at St Andrews, excelled as a student of the works of Plato and Aristotle, and was a skilled musician; the second named (who, though not suffering martyrdom, like Hamilton and Wishart, was most cruelly treated at St Andrews by his ecclesiastical superiors and had to flee the country), became the friend of Cranmer, Luther, and Melancthon, was held in high respect by Calvin and Beza, laboured successfully as Professor of Theology at Frankfort-on-the-Oder and Leipzig, wrote many commentaries on Books of Scripture, and was honoured and beloved throughout his life of exile on the Continent of Europe; and the last named was a younger brother of the Laird of Pittarrow in the Mearns, studied at Aberdeen, Cambridge, and Continental seats of learning, was no mean artist, possessed the accomplishment (rare then in Scotland) of a knowledge of Greek and was the translator from German into English of the first Helvetic Confession. There is no doubt whatever that it was among the choice spirits, earnest scholarly young men—in the monasteries and among the alumni of the Universities—that the new teaching took root and flourished.

The commotions in the country disastrously affected Douglas's University. We see this in the few students who enrolled when the Reformation struggle was going on. There is only one entry in the Rector's books for

the year 1558, and it is as follows: ' *Nomus Rectoratus Mgri Joanni Douglasii præpositi Novi Collegii Mariani. Hoc anno propter tumultus religionis ergo exsertos, paucissimi scholastici ad hanc Universitatem venerunt.*' There were only three 'incorporati' in St Mary's College during that year. In 1559 the usual public graduation ceremonies—' *veteres ritus*'—were dispensed with. Later, however, things improved, for we find, that at St Leonard's at least, in 1563, there were twelve students enrolled, and in 1569 the number rose to twenty-four.

Douglas owed his preferment in the University to the Commendator of the Priory, the Lord James Stewart, afterwards Earl of Moray, who seems to have had a liking for him. The Lord James, as Prior, along with his brethren of the Priory, exercised the patronage of the University during the vacancy in the Archbishopric caused by the assassination of Cardinal Beaton. Archbishop Hamilton continued Douglas in his offices, even though the former had altered and extended the foundation for the purposes of strengthening the Romish Church. While several of the professors or masters of St Salvator's College, including Principal William Cranston, adhered to the old faith, and resigned, or had to resign, their appointments, nearly all the professors or masters of St Mary's and St Leonard's embraced Reformation principles and retained their places, these including John Douglas, who was the Principal of St Mary's or New College, and John Duncanson, who was Principal of St Leonard's.

Before the Reformation, the Provost or Principal of St Mary's or New College, besides exercising the ordinary jurisdiction of the College, and presiding at the theological disputations once a week, had to read a lecture

on the Sacred Scriptures or to preach every Monday. Along with the other Professors, he had also to say Mass at stated times. The immediate predecessor of Douglas was Archibald Hay who, in a panegyric he wrote on Cardinal Beaton when he was elevated to that high office, censures with much freedom the ignorance, negligence, and hypocrisy of the clergy. He makes no reference, however, by way of approbation or condemnation to the reformed opinions. This Provost Hay exceeded most of his countrymen at the time in learning and liberal views. He was a true child of the Renaissance. In the panegyric or pamphlet he lays down a plan of teaching for the New College, and says that it will be of far more consequence to procure teachers capable of instructing the youths in the three learned languages than to endow a rich but illiterate College; he would like teachers of Chaldee and Arabic added to the professoriate, and while not proposing to banish the *Peripatetic* philosophy from the Schools, yet would like to see the study of 'the divine Plato' take the place of scholastic *argutiæ*. He deprecates the neglect of Roman Law and extols the science of Mathematics.

Whether, after the Reformation, the professors and students continued to wear the habiliments of the older days, we know not, but, according to the papal bull which erected the College, the professors, regents, and students were to wear caps after the Parisian manner; and all the scholars, including the noble and wealthy, as well as the bursars, were to wear gowns bound round with a girdle, to which the bursars were to add a black hood. By the bull of Julius III., as well as that of Paul III., the College had the power of conferring degrees in all the faculties, and the jurisdiction over the bursars belonged to the Principal from

whom an appeal lay to the Archbishop and the Pope with exclusion of any other judge. The College was provided with ample funds. It may be further added that the curriculum of students of Theology extended to six sessions or years, and, while that of the students of Philosophy is not stated, they, before their admission, were to be initiated into grammar and the Latin tongue so as to be able to express themselves properly in that language at disputations and examinations. Douglas, as the successor of the liberal-minded Hay, succeeded in bridging the passage from the old to the new without any evident break. Such a piece of work is creditable to him, and in a quiet way must have greatly helped the Reformation cause. It is a matter of thankfulness that a man of his type—academic and moderating—was at St Andrews at that time to do it.<sup>1</sup>

Knox in his History has at least three references to John Douglas—assuming, as is the contention of David Laing (endorsed also by Hume Brown), that it is the other Douglas, called also Grant, whom he speaks of as a heretic in the eyes of Archbishop Hamilton, and who makes some other appearances in his History. Knox mentions the subject of this chapter as one of those who were appointed to draw up the *First Book of Discipline* that ‘the Kirk mycht be established in a good and Godlie policy,’ and he adds that the same six divines had also ‘done the Doctrine,’ that is to say, had drawn up the first *Confession of Faith*.

With regard to Douglas’s share in the Book of Discipline, Mr Hannay, in his Introduction to the *Rentale Sancti Andree*, mentions the curious fact that while Douglas and Winram were working at the said Book—or about that time—they were also engaged in revising the Statutes of the Theologians, and that it is

<sup>1</sup> See Notes 1 and 2.

through them that there has been preserved for us one of the most valuable accounts in existence of the old pre-Reformation ceremonial connected with the installation of a Doctor of Theology at St Andrews. It may be stated here, too, that, according to Principal Lee, the chapter on Schools and Colleges in the *Book of Discipline*, which has elicited so much praise, was mainly the production of those two St Andrews 'Johns,' John Douglas and John Winram.

In the year 1564, Douglas appears in Knox's History as one of those chosen, along with other leading ministers, to discuss with Lethington and the lords, the propriety of Queen Mary's having the Mass celebrated in her private chapel, and also to discuss other related topics. In 1566, when the lords were anxious for the help of the General Assembly, after the Queen had been sent as a captive to Lochleven, and the Hamiltons were scheming in her favour, Knox tells us that Douglas was one of the Commissioners appointed to confer with the lords on the situation. There are some earlier references by Knox to a John Douglas, preaching in Edinburgh and Leith, and thus helping on the cause of Reform; but it is not easy to say which of the John Douglasses it is. Most likely it is Douglas alias Grant, Chaplain to the Earl of Argyll, for surely the Provost of St Mary's College, St Andrews, and Head of the University there, could not have left these posts at that time to become a preacher of the new doctrines. He would possibly have risked immediate deprivation by doing so.

The following letter may here be inserted. The original is preserved in the archives at Zurich, and the letter is of considerable interest as showing the kindly relations subsisting between the Scottish and the Swiss churches. Among others, the names of the six Johns



are adhibited with the exception of that of Willock, who evidently at that time was in England. Of some significance is the fact that the first signature is that of 'John Douglas, rector of the University of St Andrews and professor of St Mary's College.'

'To the very eminent Servant of Christ  
Master Theodore Beza, the most learned  
And vigilant Pastor of the  
Genevan Church.'

Health and peace from the Lord! We have lately, most vigilant Christian Pastor, read your letter sent to our very dear brother John Knox, and it has indeed affected us in various ways. For in as much as you state that your Churches are in the enjoyment of great peace and tranquillity, this intelligence was very gratifying to us, as it ought to be. But whereas you inform us that some persons are found in the syncretism<sup>1</sup> of Augsburg, whom either ignorance or obstinacy may excite to raise disturbance among them and for whose sake there has been appointed a conference of sovereigns, this is indeed painful and distressing news. But as we understood from that same letter that you and your brethren earnestly request of us to signify our approbation of your Confession, and simple exposition of the orthodox faith, and Catholic doctrines of the pure Christian religion, recently set forth in the month of March, with the unanimous assent of the ministers of the Church who are in Switzerland, namely, those of Zurich, Berne, Schaffhausen, St Gall, the Grisons, and their confederates, Mulhausen and Bienne, to which the ministers of the Church of Geneva have

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch uses the expression, and it means that opponents, now reconciled among themselves, have joined their united forces against a third party.

joined themselves ; in this we acknowledge and declare the courtesy towards us, both of yourself and your brethren, who express so much esteem for the Scots, a people serving the Lord with the pure worship of religion in the farthest corners of the earth, as to consider that their agreement will add much to the light and splendour of the Christian religion, which you have embraced in that treatise. Wherefore, that our diligence might not be wanting to so great courtesy, and so just a request, as soon as we received your letter, we all of us, from every town in the neighbourhood, assembled at St Andrews, the most flourishing city as to divine and human learning in all Scotland ; and there, as specially as we could, when we had read over the book, we considered each chapter by itself and left nothing unexplored, and diligently examined everything, respecting God, the sacred laws and rites of the Church. And it is impossible to express the exceeding delight we derived from that work, when one clearly perceived that in your little book was most faithfully, holily, piously and indeed divinely explained, and that briefly, whatever we have been constantly teaching these eight years, and still, by the grace of God, continue to teach, in our churches, in the schools and in the pulpit.

‘ We are therefore altogether compelled, as well by our consciences as from a sense of duty, to undertake its patronage and not only to express our approval, but also our exceeding commendation of every chapter and every sentence. For that little treatise rests altogether upon the holy scriptures, which we both profess, and are prepared to defend at the risk of our lives, or even to the shedding of blood. And we have all of us, as many as by reason of the shortness of the time allowed as were able to be present, both sub-

scribed our names, and sealed this letter with the common seal of the University. But if you should think that it would be of use to your churches at any future time, we will send you by the first opportunity both the public subscription of this Church, and the formulary of our Confession of Faith, confirmed in the assembly of the three estates of the realm. This one thing, however, we can scarcely refrain from mentioning, with regard to what is written in the twenty-fourth chapter of the aforesaid Confession concerning the "festival of our Lord's nativity, circumcision, passion, resurrection, ascension, and sending the Holy Ghost upon his disciples," that these festivals at the present time obtain no place among us; for we dare not religiously celebrate any other feast-day than what the divine oracles have prescribed. Everything else, as we have said, we teach, approve, and most willingly embrace. We have written you this letter as briefly as possible, in consequence of the shortness of the time, but we earnestly request you not to allow the friendly correspondence now commenced between us to die away. If you will diligently do this, we will endeavour to return you the like favour. May the Lord Jesus prosper, as long as possible, the pious exertions of yourself and brethren for the increase of the Church of Christ! Farewell.

'St Andrews, Sept. 4, 1566.

'Your most loving brethren in Christ,  
John Douglas, rector of the University  
of St Andrews, and professor of St  
Mary's College.'

(Here follow other names.)

Row, in his History, informs us that, 'At the thirteenth

Assembly, holden at Edinburgh, Junii 25, 1567, Mr George Buchanan, Principal of St Leonard's College in St Androes, Moderator, Perceaving the danger of religion and reformation by the bloodie decrees of Trent, and cruell attempts of Papists in France and Flanders, and aganis Scotland in particulare, plotts both within and without the land ; and that ministers have no provision, and the poore members of Christ are starving on the streets ; and lying as dung may be regarded ; and seeing a Mutuall Band is requisit in such cases ; it is appoynted that a Generall Assemblie convene againe upon the 20 of Julie next to come, and to it invites and requyres by common letters to all Protestant noblemen and barrons, within the kingdome ; yea, and all others also of what rank soever, to assist with their counsell and concurrence in so necessare a work ; for the prosecution of whilk good work, a commission was given to a certain number of the Assemblie, with full and ample power, etc. The letters were direct and subscriyved by these Commissioners, John Erskine of Dun, Masters John Spottiswood, John Douglas, John Knox, John Row, John Craig.' Five years later, the same historian says, ' At the Twenty-fifth Assemblie, holden at St Androes, March 6, 1571[-72], Mr Robert Hamilton, Minister of St Androes, Moderator, though Mr John Douglas, Archbishop of St Androes, was present at the Assemblie . . . Ordanis the Superintendent of Fyfe to use his owin jurisdiction (as of befor) without any subjection to the Archbishop of St Androes, and requests him to concur also with the Archbishop in his visitations, whilk he exerces be vertue of his Commission till the next general Assemblie.' Then about six months after we have, ' At the Twenty-sixth Assemblie, holden at Perth, August 6, 1572, John Erskine of Dun, Moderator, Inacted, whatever

member of the Assemblie does speak unorderlie, and without leave asked and obtained of the Moderator, he shall be forthwith removed, and not get admittance to that Assemblie againe. Certain names such as Archbishop, Bishop, Archdeacon, Dean, Chancellor, Chapter, etc., being found in sundrie writes, and their names and designations being thought offensive as savouring of the Romish hierarchie, the Assemblie desyres their names changed; and protests, that in sometimes using of thir names they be not thought to agree to any poynt of Poperie. Protests also that Articles agreed upon be only for an interim, till a more perfyt ordour may be obtained at the hands of the King and the nobilitie.' Douglas had been nominated as *tulchan* Bishop by this time, and was already designated Archbishop. These two last extracts from the Assembly's proceedings show that the Church already was looking askance at such an appointment, disliking both the jurisdiction and the name.

Calderwood has numerous references to Douglas, but some of them are covered by those of Knox and Row, while others are of no great importance, with the exception of one which we shall quote later.

But of Douglas's settlement in his new office we must speak in some detail. Already in the life of Winram we have stated how these *tulchan* or phantom bishops came to be appointed and have shown how shameful a thing such an episcopate was. A wit, at that time, said that these *tulchans*, or straw-stuffed calves to cause the milk (the Church's money) to flow to the nobility, were indeed *golden* calves that lowed and chewed in Cathedral stalls. In speaking of the 'consecration' of one of them, namely the Bishop of Moray, the late Dr Dowden, Bishop of Edinburgh, in his volume *The Bishops of Scotland*, says that 'from the ecclesiastical



standpoint none of the consecrators had apparently been canonically consecrated.' This same Bishop of Moray was 'delated,' says Calderwood, 'for fornication with the Lady Ardrosse and was ordained to purge himself before the Assembly,' but it would appear from the *Book of the Universal Kirk* that he eventually cleared himself of a charge so grave. He was 'put to the horn,' however, for bankruptcy. Archbishop Adamson was a man of notoriously crooked, even wicked, ways; the Bishop of Dunkeld was deposed for allowing the dilapidation of benefices; and, while Andrew Graham was certainly no Saint Ambrose, he emulated the great Bishop of Milan by becoming Bishop of Dunblane, when he was only a layman. These *tulchans* indeed formed a bench of Bishops which men could only ridicule and despise. The Roman Catholic view is expressed thus by Nicol Burne in his *Disputation* (1581): 'Maister John Douglas vald nocht say that he succedit to the bischop of Sanct-androis, quhilk vas befoir him, nor vald nocht acknowledge him as ane lawchful bischop.' The story of the Scottish Bishops is really both amazing and amusing. We have seen, or shall see, how the *tulchans* were made. Later, we find kings and parliaments making and unmaking bishops, and General Assemblies casting them out. The Scots being without apostolic succession of their own, English prelatie hands were called upon to give it, and that not with the best grace.

John Douglas was seventy-eight years of age when he was appointed to the metropolitan see of St Andrews, rendered vacant through Archbishop Hamilton having been taken prisoner at Dumbarton and hanged in his robes at the market cross of Stirling for being privy to the murders of Darnley and Moray. Douglas was certainly in his dotage, or surely he would not have

consented to take the archi-episcopal title with so many humiliating conditions attached. Nearly all the revenues were to go to the Earl of Morton. Some months before his inauguration in 1572, he had been nominated—practically appointed to the office. He used the title and had been required to vote as Archbishop in the Parliament held at Stirling, but, as we have seen in our fourth chapter, Winram opposed his voting as the Assembly had not yet taken cognisance of the matter, and threatened him with excommunication. Douglas had long enjoyed the quiet of an academic retreat, his opportunities for mingling with the world had been few, he was now as we have seen a frail old man—‘a man,’ says Calderwood, ‘meeter for the grave than for the throne of a bishop, unable of his body to travel and more unable by his tongue to teach,’ and, therefore, surely the last man one would deem suitable for holding such an exalted rank as Primate of Scotland; yet, puppet or not, he received the royal presentation under the Great Seal to ‘all and hail the benefice of St Andrews, as well temporality as spirituality,’ and received the style ‘Most reverend Father in God Archbishop of St Andrews.’ In one document, at least, we have seen his signature as ‘J. Sanct Androis.’ An edict or rescript had been sent to the dean and chapter of the diocese (now strangely composed and constituted) to elect the new prelate, but the Earl of Morton, who was present, arranged all things for his own nominee being selected.

There has been a strange white-washing recently of certain historical characters, and the Regent Morton has partly come under the process. It has been averred that he was not personally avaricious, and Mr T. F. Henderson, who is inclined to such a view, deals somewhat fully with the matter in his article on the Regent

in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. Wodrow says of him that, in creating *tulchan* bishops, he had other than private reasons such as his own enrichment, for he wished to divide the Queen's party. He was anxious, says this historian, 'to take the cheise of them from Lethington, the Hamiltons, and others, now masters of the castle and town of Edinburgh, and who had called a Parliament to meet in the Queen's name in opposition to the King and Regent.' So with the baits of the ecclesiastical revenues he drew to his side the Earls of Argyll, Cassilis, Eglinton, and Lord Boyd, who hitherto had leaned to the Queen's side, and probably also the Earls of Crauford, Errol, and Rothes. By such 'pretty strong arguments,' Wodrow adds, 'Bishoprics, Priories, Abbayes and the like,' Morton greatly strengthened his position. But as to Morton's avarice we shall have something to say later.

Let us now look at the inauguration ceremony. We have the following from an eye-witness, James Melville, who writes in his *Diary*: 'I saw Mr Jhone Woundram, Superintendent, inaugurat (as they called it) B. Dowglas that honourable father of the Universitie, Rector thereof for the present, a guid upright-hearted man bot ambitious and simple; nocht knawing wha delt with him . . . [while he held the Archbishopric] he haid nather that honour, welth nor helthe as he was wount to haiff, ever repenting that he tuk it on.' Calderwood gives us more details. He belonged to the next generation, but doubtless would receive his information from reliable sources. He says, 'Great debate there was at the election; but in the end the Rector was chosen, notwithstanding that manie ministers opposed. George Scott, Minister of Kirkaldie, tooke instruments that he condescended not . . . After sermon, the Superintendent of Fife went up to

the pulpit, and made an exhortation upon the first chapter of the Epistle to Titus. The exhortation being ended, he followed the order which was used in admission of Superintendents, demanding the same questions and the Rector answering, having his answers written in paper and reading them after every question. Mr William Cocke, Bailiffe of Sanct Andrews, answered in name of the people; thereafter the Bishop of Caithnesse [Robert Stewart], Mr John Spottiswood Superintendent of Lothian, and Mr David Lindsay [Minister of Leith], sitting with the Rector upon a forme before the pulpit in time of the sermon, layed their hands upon him, and embraced him in signe of admission to the Archbishoprick. Being demanded if any simoniacal paction was made, or was to be made, he answered "No," but it was not true. Being demanded if he would be obedient to the Kirk and usurpe no power over the same, answered, He would claime no greater power nor the Counsell and Generall Assemblie suld prescribe.' Knox was greatly displeased at all this, and pronounced anathema both on the receiver of the bishopric and on the giver. He said that Douglas would 'be disgraced and wrecked' by what he had done. It was deplorable, he urged, that so aged a man should be burdened with duties which twenty of the best men in the Church could not, and would not, bear. He was grieved, too, that the new Archbishop should retain the offices of Principal and Rector and that the Assembly should sanction such a plurality of functions. There are some, among them Hill Burton, who have urged that Knox at this time was not an opponent of the order of Bishops, and that there are other transactions of the period which indicate that he was agreeable to the episcopal order being restored. Into that matter we shall enter shortly, showing precisely what

Knox's attitude was—though we may say here that if for a time he did agree to an episcopate, it was to a very modified one—but what was agitating his mind on this occasion was not the question of bishop or no bishop, but quite another matter. Consequently he has no denunciation at the moment for prelacy as such, but what he strongly denounces is the sort of bishop they are making, the revenues of the see being appropriated by Morton, the ministers being duped and a grave injury done to the Church. Knox preached the sermon, but firmly refused to take any part in the ceremony of installation. John Rutherford, Principal of St Salvator's College, insinuated that his disappointment arose from an envious feeling that he himself had been passed over; but the great Reformer made short work of an insinuation so unworthy. On the following Sunday he preached at St Andrews and, in the course of his sermon—delivered with his old fire, though he was in much bodily frailty—said that he had refused a greater bishopric than that (Rochester, though some have said Durham), which he could have had by the favour of greater men, and that any repining on his part was for the discharge of his conscience and he still had that repining. He added that the Church of Scotland should not be subject to the order of Bishops, seeing that the *First Book of Discipline* had settled a very different one which many of the nobility had approved. In the General Assembly, which met at St Andrews in the following month, he not only entered his protest against the election of Douglas, but also, says James Melville, 'opponed himself directly, zealouslie, to the making of bishops.' Moreover, we learn from the *Book of the Universal Kirk* that he wrote a letter from Fife to the Assembly, which met at Stirling, warning the members of the dangers of this innovation, predicting a



severe and protracted struggle, and counselling courage, perseverance, and strenuous exertion. Calderwood prints a letter written later, to the Assembly convened at Perth, from the first perusal of which one might be inclined to infer that Knox approved of the new prelates, but, on further study, it appears to be rather a sad acquiescence in a state of matters which he, now feeble in health and nearing the grave, could no longer prevent. Moreover, if the instructions and suggestions contained in the letter had been acted upon—more particularly those with regard to the kind of men who should be appointed to the ‘benefices’ and their being required to give ‘an accompt of their whole rents and intromissions therewith once a year as the Kirk sall appoint’—then the dangerous designs of Morton on the Church would, in great measure, have been thwarted.

These sayings and doings of Knox should sufficiently answer Hill Burton and others.

Knox also dealt plainly and pointedly with Morton for his part in these transactions. Hume of Godscroft informs us that he ‘rebuked Morton sharply for diverse things, but specially for his labouring to get up and maintain the state of bishops,’ and when he was dying, he exhorted with great earnestness that nobleman to maintain the Church of God and its ministers in a worthy manner, warning him that if he did not, ‘God would spoil him of all, and his end would be ignominy and shame’—a prediction which this strange man of many parts admitted, before his execution, he had ‘fand true indeed.’ A poet, or perhaps rather rhymster, of those days—John Davidson, then a student at St Andrews, and afterwards minister of Prestonpans—in his dialogue entitled *A Conference between the Clerk and the Courtier*, lamenting the evil resulting from

Morton's policy, expresses the wish that John Knox had only lived a few years longer to denounce such shameful doings, and says :—

' Had John Knox not yet been deid  
It had not come unto this heid,  
Had they myntit till sic ane steir  
He had made heavin and earth to hear.'

Lord Balfour of Burleigh in his little book on Presbyterianism in Scotland remarks that the Regent Morton was 'a stout political Protestant, but an Erastian and was no favourer of the Church's liberties nor respecter of its ministers'; that through him 'odium gathered round the name and office of bishop'; that 'the Church's chief ministers were the creation of himself and his friends' and that 'he needed money for the public service and to satisfy his private avarice,' and accordingly 'starved the Church.' But let us hear a great contemporary of Morton, George Buchanan, who, in his History, pithily puts it thus: 'In the midst of his exaltation there was nothing procured him more universal dislike than his conduct towards the Church, from whose ministers he extorted the greater part of the slender pitance upon which at the best they could scarcely exist.'

Patrick Adamson, at the time a zealous Presbyterian minister, and not yet corrupted by Court influence, made an ironical observation when preaching on these matters on a certain Sunday at that time. He said—and his words deeply impressed the hearers then, and do still impress the Scottish people—that there were three sorts of Bishops—'My Lord Bishop, My Lord's Bishop, and the Lord's Bishop. My Lord Bishop, that was in the time of the Papistry; My Lord's Bishop, that is now when my lord gets the benefice, and the Bishop only serves to make his title sure; and the

Lord's Bishop, that is the true minister' of the Gospel.' We may add that on the Sunday after the inauguration of Douglas, a poetical satire in Latin—entitled *Insomnium*<sup>1</sup>—was posted on the gate of St Mary's College, and on the church door.<sup>2</sup>

Roman Catholics and Anglicans may smile and scoff at such a prelate as John Douglas—or rather perhaps at a Reformation which resulted in such doings—yet though this old man should not have accepted such an office—and we too may well laugh at such a *tulchan*—the Roman Catholic Church in Scotland, not so many years before, had far less worthy men among its dignitaries. Cardinal Beaton was utterly immoral, and Archbishop Hamilton sinned likewise. Both did worse than live in concubinage. Of course, there were some sincerely religious men holding high ecclesiastical positions—men earnest, scholarly, wise, prudent—such as William Elphinstone, Bishop of Aberdeen, but the following incident, as recorded by David Laing in his *Lyndsay*, tells its own tale. On one occasion, when James V. was surrounded by a number of nobles, and a great company of bishops and abbots, Sir David Lyndsay, humbly saluting the King, looked as if he intended to make an important request. James asked what he would have. 'Sir,' said Sir David, 'I have long served your Grace, and expected to be rewarded as others are. Now, your master tailor is dead, and I desire your Grace to bestow this benefice upon me.' 'Why would you be my tailor?' demanded the King. 'You can neither shape nor sew.' 'That matters not,' replied the Knight. 'You have given bishoprics and benefices to many standing here though they can neither preach nor teach.'

<sup>1</sup> See Note 3.

<sup>2</sup> See Note 4 for Pitscottie's remarks.

Before we pass from the appointment of Douglas, it should be stated that in this strange episode the Church not only had a struggle for her spiritual independence, but won a notable victory. The State had endeavoured to alter her constitution, and compel her to receive the Archbishop against her will. She protested to Parliament against such an encroachment on her powers and privileges, would not tolerate Douglas's acceptance of the office, and threatened to excommunicate him if he persisted in the course he was pursuing. The Earl of Morton, however, supported by Parliament, insisted that he should take his place in the General Assembly as Archbishop and vote there. Thus the two jurisdictions, the civil and the ecclesiastical, came into conflict. Morton gave way, and the honours were with the Church. She conserved her independence. It is said that the credit of this success was due to Erskine of Dun, who wrote to the Earl of Mar—his kinsman—at that time Regent, who went to the Earl of Morton, and persuaded him not to press matters further. Erskine's letter, which will be found in Calderwood's History, is a valuable document, deserving careful perusal, as it shows most clearly the respective spheres of the two jurisdictions. We are not forgetting that the Church gave way later, and that Morton had his victory. The Church, however, soon saw the evils of the Regent's system, and began to prepare her new charter, namely, the *Second Book of Discipline*. Religious considerations were not to be usurped by political, the Church was not to become a branch of the State like the Civil Service, nor was the headship of the Regent Morton or James VI. to be substituted for that of Christ. Knox had to fight for the freedom of the Church to form its own constitution, and be supreme in spiritual matters; the time had now come for it to

resist the encroachments of the Crown upon its rights in the choosing of its ministers. If power was given to the king, the regent, or the nobles, to present ministers to charges, the spiritual independence of the Church would be in grave danger, and the very preaching of the Gospel imperilled. Knox had settled the question of the divine right of popes; it rested with Melville to settle that of the divine right of kings.

Our new Archbishop sat as a member of the Kirk-Session of St Andrews. In the list of elders and deacons chosen on 12th October 1571,<sup>1</sup> we find among the 'eldars' the name of 'Mr Johne Dowglass, Archbishop and Rector of Sanctandr.' But much earlier—long before he became a prelate—we find from the Register of the Kirk-Session of St Andrews of date March 21st, 1559, (when causes of divorce were tried before the Reformed Church courts, previously to the erection of the commissary courts, and the particular case was that of Rantoun against Geddie), the following entry: 'We, the ministers and seniors of this our Christian congregation within the parochin of Sanctandrous, judges in the actioun and causs moved—In presence of Mr Johne Dowglass, Rector of the Universitie of Sanctandrous, Johne Wynrame, sub-priour, men of singular eruditioun and understanding of the Scriptures and Word of God, and Masteris William Skene [afterwards Dean of the Faculty of Arts, Commissary of Saint Andrews, etc.] and Johne Ruthirfurd [afterwards Provost of St Salvator's College], men of cunning in sindrie sciences, with quhome we communicet the secretis of the meritis of the said actioun and caus being to us and them heard and seene,' etc. Douglas

<sup>1</sup> It must always be remembered that the style and title are given to him, and his troubles began, in the year of his nomination, which was that preceding his formal inauguration.



appears to have been chosen regularly as an elder for many years, such office-bearers at that time being elected annually. Dr Hay Fleming says that, when he sat as Archbishop, it was by letters in his name that delinquents from other parishes were summoned, and at their trials he sat as judge, although the advice and consent of the Session was taken; in purely local cases, on the other hand, he acted with the Session, the judgment seemingly belonging to it.

There are two curious, if not amusing, entries in the Register connected with matrimonial quarrels, of which the Session took cognisance. In one case a certain jealous husband 'in signe of concord, amitie, and simple remit of all displesor,' at the request of Mr Douglas, 'kissed and embraced' his spouse, 'and drank to hyr'; and in the other, a man's wife, who confessed that she had not been so obedient 'as becam hyr of dewtie towards hyr husband,' at the desire of Mr Douglas, on her knees asked him for forgiveness, and her father became 'cautioner' that in future she should be 'ane gud and fythfull wyff and servand' to him. As regards the drinking, in the first of these cases, as a sign of concord and forgiveness, Dr Hay Fleming points out that such a custom long flourished among the craftsmen of St Andrews.

Discipline may have been severe, and some of the punishments may now seem ludicrous, but the Reformed Church of Scotland did not adopt the pre-Reformation punishment of making male and female penitents march at the head of a procession in church clad only in their shirts, as we learn they did from the Burgh Records of Stirling and the Council Register of Aberdeen. Nor were excommunications in the new Church anything like those in the old. The latter employed these excommunications or cursings, not only for trans-

gressions of the moral law, but also for the collecting of teinds, debts, and other purposes. The language and punishments of the greater excommunication must have struck terror into the members of the Church. While the Reformers did not abolish this weapon, they endeavoured to bring it into harmony with the teaching of Holy Scripture, on which it was based as regards its method and purpose. There really should not be so much censure and ridicule passed on Scottish ecclesiastical discipline. Was it not as severe in the Church of England? At any rate, we find that in the sister Church penitents were required to appear publicly in church clad in a distinctive garb. From the Register of Canterbury we learn that incontinent persons were 'carted,' a man going before them ringing a brazen basin.

But our Scottish Reformers and their like-minded contemporaries were not so narrow after all, for in the same *Register of St Andrews' Kirk-Session*, we read that games such as golf, football, and throwing the hammer were objected to only when indulged in on the Lord's day or during other times of public religious service. Not only so, but we actually find in these old records that the elders sometimes found the golf-course and other places of open-air pastime so alluring that they neglected the meetings of the Kirk-Session.

A curious charge was made against Douglas in the General Assembly which convened at Edinburgh in March 1572-3. The minister of Holyrood House, John Brand by name, alleged that the titular Archbishop had authorised a popish priest, named Forrest, to administer the Sacrament of Baptism at Swinton in Berwickshire, in violation of the injunctions of Spottiswood, the Superintendent. Douglas answered that 'the foresaid priest had recanted all Papestrie in the Kirk of St

Andrews, and thereafter he admitted him to administer the Sacrament of Baptism.'

In the satirical poem—more than once referred to in this book—on Patrick Adamson, who became second *tulchan* Archbishop, John Douglas is introduced. Adamson was already following devious ways, and the satirist says :—

' He beggit buikis, he beggit bowis [bowls]  
Tacking in earnest, asking in mowes [jest]  
As Maister John Dowglass weill can tell,  
How slealie he deceavit him sell ;  
Borrowing ane coffer to keep his claithis  
Bot with his baggage hame he gaas.'

Douglas witnessed a pretty sight at Stirling one day. King James was there—a mere child—and here is the scene as depicted by Pitscottie : ' Thair was ane Parliament holding at Stirling be my Lord Regent and many nobill lordis and barronis war thairat, to wit the Erle of Angus, Argyle, Glencairne, Morton, Buchan, Mentrois, Mershell, Mar, with many other lordis and barronis with the Universities, sic as Archbishop of Sanctandros with dyveris utheris bischopis, the Kingis Majestie being brocht furth of the Castell downe to the tolbuith with gret triumphe, the crowne beand on his heid, the uther crowne bearand be his guidshir the Regent, baith borne under ane pail, the cepture and the sword also befor thame borne. The King being littill mair nor four zeirs or fyve of aige, his Majesty made ane proper oratioun in Parliament to the comfort of all the nobilitie.'

Douglas did not long survive his appointment to the Archbishopric—only some three years, and they must have been troublous years to him. The rents received were insufficient for the new rank he was expected to sustain ; the University complained against his plurality

of offices ; the Assembly took him to task for various delinquencies, some of which he would not admit while for others he pleaded ignorance and bodily weakness. He seems to have felt much the Assembly's strictures on him for not preaching, and, resolving to make an effort once more, on a day in July 1574 he entered the pulpit of the parish church of St Andrews and began to preach, but his strength wholly departing from him, he fell down dead. He would be in the eighty-first or eighty-second year of his age.<sup>1</sup>

In St Leonard's College, there used to be an old manuscript by Francis Pringle, at one time Professor of Greek there (1699-1747). The manuscript has been missing for many years, but Lyon, in his *History of St Andrews* published in 1843, says that Douglas was buried in the public cemetery without any monument, and bases his statement on the following quotation from Pringle's MS. : ' In publico cemeterio sub cospete sine ulla inscriptione vel monumento.'

We need not discuss or summarise Douglas's character, as the manner of man he was is apparent from what we have already said regarding him. He was evidently a likeable man, and made friends readily. Knox was drawn to him. However displeased the former may have been through Douglas's accepting the *tulchan* Archbishopric, and though he had to 'speak against him' for such conduct, it was done, says James Melville, 'bot sparingly because he loved the man.' Douglas was probably unmarried. At any rate he is the only one of the six Johns concerning whom there is no reference in documents, contemporary or subsequent,

<sup>1</sup> His Archbishopric did not enrich him, for the 'Summa of his Inventor' amounted only to £280, 4s. 4d., which estate included 'his L[ordships] liberall [library] of bukis, extending to ane hundred pundis.'

or in any of the histories, to a wife or posterity. We have not been able to discover whether any books or tractates came from the pen of this learned rector, principal and archbishop; if there were any, oblivion, unmercifully or mercifully, has long covered them.

## APPENDIX

### NOTE I

#### ST MARY'S COLLEGE, ST ANDREWS, IN DOUGLAS'S TIME

Principal Lee, of Edinburgh University, who at one time was Professor of Divinity and Ecclesiastical History in St Mary's College, made full enquiry into the matter, and more particularly into the changes introduced by Archbishop Hamilton, with the following result: 'Under the new constitution [that of Archbishop Beaton in 1538] the college was dedicated to the Virgin Mary and contained two professors of divinity, a professor of canon law, another of civil law, and four regents of philosophy. What defects Archbishop Hamilton discovered in this arrangement of study I do not pretend to know, but soon after his accession he seems to have resolved to alter it, and accordingly, in the year 1552, he obtained authority from Pope Julius III. to carry his plan into execution. The establishment which he chose to introduce was by far the most extensive of any of the academical institutions in this city, comprehending no fewer than thirty-six founded persons; but he seems to have expected that the same funds which Beaton had assigned to the maintenance of eight masters and six choristers should be sufficient to support three times the number. His distribution of appointments was very different from that of his predecessors in the see—namely, a provost and two other principal masters, all professors of divinity; one professor of the sacred canons, or the pontifical law; eight priests, who were diligently to apply to the study of theology during a course of six years and to qualify themselves to solve all the difficulties which occur in Holy Writ; three professors or regents of philosophy, for teaching logic, ethics, physics, mathematics, and other



liberal arts ; a professor of rhetoric or oratory ; and another of grammar ; and sixteen students of philosophy. These endowments merit no praise on the ground of liberality, as he only confirmed what had been granted before, and required it to be divided among a much greater number. But there is a great parade of ostentatious and provident kindness manifested to the tender little flock (as he calls them) who were to be the future inmates of these walls, and whom he was most anxious to defend from the grievous wolves that lay in wait for their destruction. The object of the whole system evidently was to train up the candidates for the Church as expert wranglers, and ready speakers on every point of theological speculation, as well as to prepare them by strict discipline for conducting themselves with exemplary decorum, both in their private capacities and in their public ministrations. Those who are described as students of theology were not persons who had never been in the situation of applying to that study before. They are designed *sacerdotes omnes* ; and before their admission to their six years' course, it was necessary that they should give proof, by three public examinations, that they were well grounded in the principles of sacred erudition. Being in priests' orders, they were regularly to celebrate Mass in their turns—every one of them in their order—performing the duty on the successive week-days, and two on the Lord's day. They were to be constantly present at the lectures of the first, second, and third master, and in rotation they were to give public exhibitions of their skill in illustrating the text of the Sentences (the standards of divine learning in those times), every lawful day, from 1st October to the 1st March. After accomplishing the period of their studies they were expected to be prepared to rank as licentiates (the highest rank of graduates except doctors), and to undertake the most important charges in the Church. Even when they were attending their studies in the college they were considered as being entitled to no slight pre-eminence. They took precedence of all the other founded persons, except the teachers of divinity and canon law. The regents of philosophy, as well as the orator and grammarian, were an inferior order. This appears to have been one of Hamilton's innovations, though, before his time, there is reason to think that the students of theology generally acted as regents, as the same class of persons did in King's College in Aberdeen, according to Bishop Elphinston's constitution or character of that University.

The Archbishop seems to have gone far and near to beat up for recruits, or else there must have been much canvassing to gain admission into this seminary of polemics. The primate had been abbot of Paisley, and, we find, soon after the new erection of the college, the provost of the collegiate church of Bothwell and two monks of Paisley matriculated in the album among the Incorporati of St Mary's College. In the same year, two monks of Arbroath are enrolled. Almost every year a colony of Hamilton's peopled the apartments both of St Mary's and the other colleges. Very soon after the Reformation (at least in 1569), five of the nine professors were Hamiltons, namely, Robert, Archibald, Alexander, James, and John. This John was a secular priest afterwards, but about this time he was an elder of the reformed Kirk-Session of St Andrews; while Robert Hamilton, the Principal of the college, was minister of the parish. In 1569, John Hamilton was one of the regents or teachers of philosophy.

The Archbishop, as chancellor and patron of the University, had the principal voice in all nominations, and he seems to have been so short-sighted as to expect that, when he was bestowing the children's bread on men of his own name and lineage, he was building up the walls of the Catholic Church on a sure foundation, and mustering around him a legion of united brethren, against whom the efforts of revolutionary upstarts would never be able to prevail. In none of his infatuated measures was he ever more misled. His partiality estranged many who would have been his firm adherents; and three or four of these highly-favoured kinsmen whom he had fed at his table, and promoted at an early age to appointments in his college, were among the first who revolted from his interest. Whether their defection arose from disappointment at not being preferred at once to the chief places, or from some selfish consideration, or from some treacherous collusion with the primate, whom they still continued to regard as their friend, it is impossible to determine; but I cannot believe that the change in their case arose from principle, as most of them apostatised many years afterwards, and became the bitterest enemies of the reformers. So it was, however, that the New College of St Andrews, instead of proving what Hamilton intended it to be, a nursery of zealous defenders of the Roman hierarchy, was the school from which proceeded the greatest number of persons who were recommended by the first General Assembly of the reformed church, as being apt

and able for ministering and teaching. This perhaps may be ascribed in a great measure to the influence of Douglas, the principal of the college, who had been appointed to that station during the vacancy after Cardinal Beaton's death, by Lord James Stewart, commendator of the priory, and John Wynram, sub-prior, and who was continued in his office by Hamilton. Whatever the cause might be, the fact is certain.'—*Lectures on the History of the Church of Scotland*.

## NOTE 2

## STUDENT LIFE AT ST ANDREWS IN PRE-REFORMATION DAYS

Though the following table of College hours on common days has specific reference to the College of St Leonard's, it may serve to give a picture of University life in general at St Andrews when John Douglas was at the head of his College there. For such interesting information we are indebted to Principal Sir John Herkless's and Mr Hannay's volume, *The College of St Leonard's, Being Documents with Translations, Notes, and Historical Introductions*. The table is compiled by the authors from the scattered information in the documents. No precise hours are stated for ordinary lectures and therefore the hours given below are only conjecture.

## TABLE

5 a.m.	College awakened and gates opened in summer.
5.30 a.m.	College awakened in winter.
6 a.m.	High Mass. Gates opened in winter. [First Mass (without singing) on feast days.]
7 a.m.	General lecture by the Principal or a Regent. Regents or Chaplains having Altarages do service in summer.
8 a.m.	Each student has four ounces of bread. Regents or Chaplains having Altarages do service in winter.
9 a.m.	Lecture (?). [High Mass on Feast Days.]
10 a.m.	Lecture (?).
11 a.m.	Regula. On Fridays a general 'capitulum' for discipline.

## 344      MAKERS OF THE SCOTTISH CHURCH

- 11.30 a.m.      Dinner. A lecture after dinner three days a week (not on Saturdays).
- 1 p.m.-3 p.m.      Students go 'ad campos' (once a week). On Saturday disputations at 2 p.m.
- 3 p.m.      Vesper.
- 4 p.m.      Lecture (?).
- 5 p.m.      Regula.
- 5.30 p.m.      Supper. Daily account heard by Principal (according to visitation of 1544 it is after Salve). Repetitions after supper.
- 7 p.m.      Salve (with commemoration of St Andrew and St Leonard). The bell rings for silence after Salve.
- 8 p.m.      The Principal or Regent visits studies. Gates closed in winter.
- 9 p.m.      Gates closed in summer.
- 10 p.m.      [Outer gate of church closed on feast days: Visitation of 1544.]

### NOTE 3

#### THE INSOMNIUM

Though this pasquinade was 'affixed upon the New College Gate and upon the Kirk doore' when John Douglas was 'consecrat Bishop,' it appears to refer rather to academic than ecclesiastical matters. Calderwood says that it 'displeased not a little Mr Robert Hamilton, Mr William Skeene, and Mr Archibald Hamilton, conceaving that it tuiched them speciall.' The first named was one of the ministers of St Andrews and Provost of New (St Mary's) College, the second was Commissary for the University and Professor of Laws, while the third was also a Professor, but latterly he left Scotland for France where he made a recantation of Protestantism. The three belonged to a faction which opposed Knox, and gave him a good deal of trouble at St Andrews, the two Hamiltons being particularly unscrupulous in their methods of attack. These three may be the Fox, Proteus, and Mustafa of the poem, which is evidently the production of some clever student who wished to pay off an old score against them. He considered them haughty men — 'regales animi'—and of course pride and stand-offishness seldom, if ever, commend themselves to students. It is possible,

however, in spite of what Calderwood says, that, after all, the Triumviri lampooned are not these professors, but some other officials of St Mary's College. The repeated use of the word 'trias' (triumviri being unemployable in elegiac verse) almost seems to indicate this. From all one knows of the Hamiltons, they were not undeserving of severe castigation, but the same can scarcely be said of Skeene, who was an efficient professor, and in point of fact was popular with the students. This other question suggests itself here, and it is not without interest in our study of Douglas's life. Had the College a nickname for their Rector? One would think so from the expressions 'cauda' and 'cornua.' Did the students, then, with youthful irreverence, call the venerable head of their University the Ox or the Steer? Douglas may have been a man of large, powerful make, and of slow movement.

The argument—to use an old-world term—of the Dream is the diligence and faithfulness of Nature in all her works as compared with the laziness and worthlessness of the detested trio. The writing is vigorous, and the versification is good as regards the mechanical part. The grammar is sometimes faulty, and though the language becomes distinctly weak towards the end, it has a good Ovidian ring at the beginning. For a pasquil, however, the poem is too long. A line or couple of lines would have sufficed a witty Italian.

We append this *Insomnium* in full, with a metrical translation, premising that the recondite is simplified as much as possible, an obscene expression has been toned down, and Mustafa has been given the correct pronunciation. Couplet 4 is omitted as it repeats the preceding one. The Dreamer was evidently not sure which was the leader of the two, and somehow the printer has given us both. It may be added that our copy teems with printer's errors, and the lines are very badly punctuated, which defects are herewith removed.

## INSOMNIUM

Dum secum ætheream gestans Ariadna coronam  
 Post Phœbum thecas pellit ad alta truces,  
 Miranti in somnis sublustri nocte potentis  
 Munera naturæ mens agitata fuit.  
 Intuitus cœlum, cœli est mihi visa moveri  
 Nutu pollentis machina tota Dei ;



Machina syderiis pulchre varieta figuris  
 Visa est impositas accelerare vices.  
 Non aliter distincta suis elementa moventur  
 Sedibus æthereis sub regione Poli.  
 Subsīdens gravitate solum, domus ampla tegendis  
 Piscibus oceanus, quam dea noctis agit,  
 Quadrupedum genus, et scindentibus æra pennis  
 Præpetibus volucres, quæque animata vigent  
 Singula, perficiunt ullo sine murmure partes  
 Natura impositas, grataque vota canunt.  
 Lumina dehinc vertens Mariana palatia versus,  
 Regales animi, celsa virumque trias  
 Occurrunt Vulpes vellax, vultuque tremendus  
 Mustaffas, cujus Protea dextra tenet.  
 Obstupui tria monstra videns, quæ terra profundo  
 Respirans gremio pignora cara tulit ;  
 Et procul, O rerum que lues devotaque diris  
 Pectora, quæ tantæ vos tenuere moræ ?  
 En, triadem vocat horrisonis ululatibus ingens  
 Tartarus, inque suo clamat adesse sinu ;  
 Singula namque suas peragunt animantia partes ;  
 Vos tamen imbelles actio nulla movet,

*Vulpes.* Muneris immemorem triadem. Dant pinguia mensæ,  
 Ferula visceribus non tribuenda tuis.

An tibi fœmineo sunt hæc concessa terendo  
 Inguine, sic mandant alma statuta Patrum ?

*Proteus.* An tibi pampinea prælargum Academia lympa  
 Æs dedit, ut madidis contegerere comis ?

*Mustaffe.* An tibi tales, quo viscera fœda repleres,  
 Imperii partes res Mariana tulit ?  
 Hæc pateris, Rector ? num tecum paupere sceptro  
 Muneris oblitum grandia ferre putem ?  
 Quin caudam opponis Vulpi, quin cornua Baccho ?  
 Quin decus adjungens ubera læta boni,  
 Efficis ut tandem triadis figmenta patescant,  
 Nostra quibus longe lumina decipiunt ?  
 Sic ego, sed fessis Somnus ne linquit ocellis,  
 Claraque processit nocte abeunte dies.

## A DREAM

The night had come ; the Northern Crown  
Rose high in heaven, while, sinking down,  
The starry Huntsman sought the west.  
Night brought me sleep, but scarcely rest,  
For in an agitating dream  
I viewed great Nature's wondrous scheme.  
Methought I saw each heavenly sphere  
Divinely urged in its career,  
While under heaven frost, snow and hail,  
Storm, rain, cloud laboured without fail.  
I saw how every mote and grain  
Of solid earth, and how the main  
(House roomy for the finny race,  
Where moon-born tides keep ceaseless pace),  
How every beast, each creeping thing,  
Each mover of the soaring wing,  
Without complaint or asking why,  
Nay raising songs of thanks on high,  
Performed the part to it assigned  
Of old by the Eternal Mind.  
But now meseemed I turned my eyes  
To where St Mary's College lies.  
Who are these tall and haughty three  
That coming thence conjoined I see ?  
The wily Fox is one ; and ha !  
See Proteus and grim Mustaffa.  
Dismayed I viewed those monsters fell,  
The offspring of the lowest hell.

Then I to them, ' Ye social pests,  
Ye reprobates, say what arrests  
Your journey to your nether home.'  
Hell shouts aloud, ' Why farther roam ?  
Come, join the fiendish crew below.'  
And rightly does Hell call, I trow ;  
For other living creatures all  
Perform the tasks that on them fall  
By Nature's hests, but not so ye,  
Effeminate, toil shirking three.

From public treasure in full flow  
The coins into your purses go,  
Yielding fat meals and, Fox, for you  
Enough to pay the harlot's due.

The College wage that Proteus lifts  
 Will buy large store of Bacchus' gifts ;  
 And much of Mustaffa's good pay  
 Into his maw will find its way.  
 Such use St Mary's seat of lore  
 Makes of its basket and its store.  
 ' Ah ! Rector, do you suffer this.  
 Mustafa's talent went amiss  
 In little things ; and do you now  
 In greater things his power allow ?  
 On Master Fox now turn your tail ;  
 Before your horns let Bacchus quail ;  
 And, letting well-timed action grace  
 Your lofty academic place,  
 Lay bare all that long line of lies  
 With which these three has dazed our eyes.'  
 Thus I ; but now sleep left my bed,  
 The day had come ; the night had fled.

## NOTE 4

## PITSCOTTIE ON DOUGLAS BECOMING ARCHBISHOP

' Schortlie heirefter in the samyn moneth the x day thair of,  
 to wit february [1572] the Erle of Mortowne come furth of  
 Leith, and syne come to Sanctandros and remanit thair ane  
 quhyll, and schortlie thairefter he disponit the bishopric of  
 Sanctandros to ane honest and godlie man callit Mr Johne  
 Dowglas, Rector and Provost of the New Colledge. Quhow  
 this man had littill abilitie of tounge to preiche the Word of God,  
 nor execute the office of ane bischope, yit noch withstanding he  
 was nominat and presentit be him to be a bischope thocht he  
 was nocht qualified thairfor. Zit [yet] be that way the Erle of  
 Mortowne tuik up the proffeitt, and so he was but ane strick-  
 man,<sup>1</sup> in that caus.'

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Histories of Knox, Calderwood, Row, Spottiswood, and  
 Keith.  
*Booke of the Universall Kirk.*  
*M'Crie's Knox.*

<sup>1</sup> Strikelight, an instrument which strikes the light others use.

M'Crie's *Melville*.

Scott's *History of the Lives of Protestant Reformers in Scotland*.

Lee's *Lectures on the History of the Church of Scotland*.

Cunningham's *Church History of Scotland*.

Mitchell's *The Scottish Reformation*. Baird Lecture.

Hay Fleming's *Reformation in Scotland*.

Hay Fleming's *Handbook of St Andrews and neighbourhood*.

Hay Fleming's *St Andrew's Kirk-Session Register*. Scottish History Society.

Gordon's *Scotichronicon*.

Brown's *Church and State*. Chalmers Lecture.

*Zurich Letters* (1538-1602). Second Series. Parker Society.

*Satirical Poems of the Reformation*. Scottish Text Society.

Herkless and Hannay's *The College of St Leonard's*.

Herkless and Hannay's *Archbishops of St Andrews*.

Lyon's *History of St Andrews*.

## CHAPTER VIII

### JOHN CRAIG

THE life of this Reformer is full of romance. He was not one of the 'six Johns'—that is, he had no part in drawing up the first Scots *Confession* and the *First Book of Discipline*—but he played a very important part in the days of the Scottish Reformation. It is certainly a strange coincidence that so many of the standard-bearers at that time bore the name of John, for, in addition to the greatest of them all, and the five whose lives we have already portrayed, there were also John Craig, John Rough, and John Erskine of Dun. Moreover, two at least of the opposite party had this same Christian name—John Hamilton, the ill-starred Archbishop of St Andrews, who has been referred to frequently in this volume, and John Leslie, Bishop of Ross, who, from the point of view of the old Church, wrote the history of those stirring times, lived through them, and took considerable part in them. Besides—far away, yet profoundly influencing the Scottish Reformation—was the great John Calvin.

The subject of this biography, who came of the Craigs of Craigfintray (afterwards Craigton)—an ancient and affluent Aberdeenshire family—was born in the year 1512. His father, in the following year, fell on the field of Flodden, the grave of so many noble Scotsmen. Young Craig, in course of time, became a student of St Andrews University, and, on the completion of his education there, having taken the degree of Master



of Arts, he went to England where he became tutor in the family of Lord Dacre, a well-known nobleman who held the post of English Warden of the North. Craig, who spent two years with this family, had to return to his native land on war breaking out between England and Scotland. He joined the order of the Dominican friars, but even at this early period we find him falling under the suspicion of heresy. About that time many of the Scottish clergy were drawn to, or at least were led to make enquiries about, Lutheranism, and Craig, owing to his having been in England, or having used some expressions on religious or theological matters which were deemed too free, was arrested and thrown into prison. The charge against him, however, was withdrawn, and he was set at liberty. This was in the year 1536, and on his release he once more made his way to England, where he hoped to obtain preferment at Cambridge through Lord Dacre's influence, but was unsuccessful. He then returned to Scotland, but, like several others, he was so dissatisfied with the ignorance and intolerance of the clergy, that in the following year he left his native land for France, whence he proceeded to Italy.

There must have been something arresting about this young monk, for it was on the recommendation of one so great and influential as Cardinal Pole that he was admitted to a place among the Dominicans in the city of Bologna, where he soon became Master of the Novices. From Craig's receiving this appointment, we may infer that he had a reputation for piety and the gift or power of influencing men. He was also sent on missions in behalf of his order to various parts of Italy and to the Levant. For several years he held the office of Rector of the Dominican College at Bologna, an Italian city which was a flourishing centre of

Catholic learning. Craig must have been there in 1547, when the Council of Trent was transferred to it, one of its sessions being held in the palace of the Archbishop.

An event of much importance for Craig's spiritual life and after career took place in this city, for it was when looking for certain books in the Library of the Inquisition attached to the Monastery that he fell upon a copy of Calvin's *Institutes*. On his eagerly perusing the volume, a complete mental and spiritual change took place in him, and he became a thorough convert to Protestantism. Not only so, but he felt that he must convert others, or at least inform them of the new views of truth he had received. It is well to remember, however, that reformed doctrines had penetrated even into places in Italy that were looked upon as pontifical strongholds. In this very city of Bologna, there was a professor, John Mollio, who in the University had gone so far in his lectures towards the theology of the Reformation that he was summoned to Rome, ordered henceforth to abstain from expounding St Paul's Epistles, and was finally removed from his chair. Bucer wrote congratulating the Protestants of this city on their progress, and it was said that they could boast of being able to raise, if required, 6000 soldiers to fight against the Pope.

It was dangerous, however, for Craig to teach the new views. It might have cost him his life, but an aged father, a fellow-countryman and a kindly man, warned him of the danger to which he was exposing himself, and advised him that if he intended to become a follower of Calvin, or any other reformer, he had better, with all speed, find his way to some more tolerant country. Craig complied to the extent of procuring his discharge from the monastery, but he did not go very far from Bologna, as he was able to find a place

of refuge in the family of a neighbouring nobleman who had embraced similar views. John Row says that he became tutor to the family of this nobleman, and was in the habit of teaching his pupils in a little wood or park near the castle, whither the instructor often resorted himself alone for meditation and prayer, and, 'it being a secret pleasant place,' he could with greater liberty teach 'the young students' the new truths when they 'were with their books.' But the enemy discovered what he had been doing; he and his noble friend were delated for heresy; they were arrested by the officers of the Inquisition, and carried off to Rome as prisoners. In that city they lay for nine months in the prison of the Inquisition—a vile dungeon to which the waters of the Tiber penetrated—and then, along with others, Craig was brought to trial and condemned to be burnt at the stake on the 20th August 1559. But he escaped the execution of his sentence, for Paul IV. died in that year, and in connection with the accession of the new Pope a Jubilee was held. It so happened that the old Pontiff died not many hours previous to the very day fixed for the burning of the heretics, and in accordance with an ancient custom the prisons in Rome were all thrown open; but, while those who were confined for debt and other civil offences were liberated, heretics were granted only a partial or temporary freedom. They had to return to their cells. But Paul IV. had been very unpopular—was hated, indeed, by the people—and on the night of his death there was a riot in the city. His statue was dragged through the streets and thrown into the Tiber, and the mob broke down the prison doors and set all the prisoners unconditionally free. In the midst of the turmoil Craig was able to escape. It may be added that it was Paul IV. who restored the Inquisition, enlarged its powers, and authorised the application of torture for

the detection of the accomplices of heretics. When he was dying he commended this awful, but favourite, institution of his to the care of the Cardinals.

Along with some others, who were likewise fortunate in making their escape, Craig made his way to a house some distance from Rome ; but a company of soldiers sent in search discovered them and again made them prisoners. A strange providence now occurred. The captain of the band looked eagerly at Craig for some time, and was sure that in that poor captive he recognised a friend and benefactor. Taking him aside, he asked if he remembered once relieving a poor wounded soldier in a wood not far from Bologna. The captive at first—excited by all that had taken place—said that he could not say he remembered the incident. ‘But I remember it,’ replied the captain, ‘and I am the man whom you relieved [it occurred in the neighbourhood of the nobleman’s residence before mentioned, and Craig now remembered it] and Providence has now put it in my power to return the kindness which you showed to a distressed stranger, though I do it at great risk. You are at liberty ; your companions I must take along with me ; but for your sake I shall show them every favour in my power.’ He then gave Craig some money to help him on his way, and indicated to him how he might make his escape.

Not long after, there occurred another remarkable incident in this Scotsman’s strange, almost charmed, career, the truth of which some may doubt ; but such will likely also be sceptical of all such special interventions of Providence. No doubts, however, need be thrown on the wondrous tale, for Craig himself was wont to tell it. Both Spottiswood and Row give it, and they were the contemporaries of the subject of it, though much younger in years. Their fathers would know Craig

well, and doubtless those seniors got it at first hand. Spottiswood says that, though 'incredible it seemeth,' the subject of it 'to many of good place often repeated it as a singular testimony of God's care of him,' and Row says that he received the story from several persons who had heard Craig himself relate it, and that he was also told it by the reformer's widow, 'Dame Craig, an honest woman, *fide digna*,' who survived her husband for many years. This is the story. After his escape from Rome through the good graces of the military officer, Craig avoided as much as possible the public roads, and taking by-paths and round-about routes, which occupied much time, he found at length that his money was all spent. In his distress he prayed to God. Foot-sore and faint, he noticed that a dog was persistently following him, and that it was carrying something in its mouth. As the weary traveller looked, he saw that it was a purse. Thinking that there was some evil-disposed person near, who had seen him, and who wished to pick a quarrel with him, he tried to drive away the animal, but it still persisted in following him and showed itself friendly and affectionate. Craig then took the purse which his dumb friend seemed to be offering him, and lo! when he opened it there was found a sum of money sufficient to enable him to continue his journey for many days to come. As the receiver of the gift himself said, God in His goodness had sent it to him to be his *viaticum*.

A Roman Catholic writer, John Hamilton, in his *Facile Traictise*, also tells the story, and takes a curious view of it, suggesting that the dog, which he says was of black colour, was an incarnation or emissary of the Evil Spirit; but why the Evil One should help a heretic to elude the vigilance of the Pope he does not explain. This is what Hamilton, who was a contem-



porary of Craig, says : ‘ Frere Jhone Craig, wha cast off his cowle, gangand throw ane forest in Italie, as he vantit himself in sindrie compaignies, becaus ane blak dog gave to him be the way ane purse of gold ; the couleur of the dog may declair gif it was send be an guid spirit or nocht ; for the Halie Spirit discendit upon Christ in lykliness of ane whyt dow.’ But in much later days, also, this canine tale was connected with evil influences, a Professor of Philosophy in the University of Glasgow, George Sinclair, giving it a place in his *Satan’s Invisible World Discovered*.

Sir Walter Scott, in his *Heart of Midlothian*, makes one of his characters proudly say that money was formerly so abundant in Edinburgh—or placed so readily at the service of the State—that bars of silver were reckoned as if they were just ‘ muckle sclate stanes ’ ; and the said character—none other than the redoubtable David Deans—goes on to declare that his ‘ father saw them toom the sacks of dollars out of Provost Dick’s window intill the carts that carried them to the army at Dunse Law,’ in proof whereof douce Davie added, ‘ if ye winna believe my father’s testimony, there is the window itsell still standing in the Luckenbooths ! ’ But John Craig could give ampler proof than that for his remarkable story, because he could say, ‘ Here is the dog ; here is the purse ; and here is some of the money.’ According to Row, Craig and the dog became permanent friends, the reformer bringing it with him all the way to Edinburgh, with the purse, and some of the coins he had not used. It may be added—not of course as additional proof—that within recent years there has been placed in St Giles’ Cathedral a brass tablet in memory of Craig, on which is represented his faithful canine friend with purse in mouth. Above the dog are the well-chosen words, ‘ My Ally.’

Craig at last reached Vienna, where he preached as a Dominican (for as yet he had not severed his connection with the order) and was befriended by Arch-Duke (afterwards Emperor) Maximilian, who showed some leaning towards the reformed faith. Craig indeed became one of the court-chaplains. Pius IV. wrote demanding that this monk, and another escaped prisoner, be sent back to Rome, but Maximilian instead gave him a safe-conduct through Germany to England. Craig reached the latter country in 1560, and proceeded to Scotland where the Reformation had just been accomplished. Having offered his services to the church of Knox, and these being accepted, he conducted services in the Magdalen Chapel, situated in the very heart of the city of Edinburgh, and still raising its tower and spire above the meaner roofs. But he had well-nigh forgotten his native tongue, for he had been for twenty-four successive years in foreign lands, and his sermons were delivered in Latin, which the learned in the city highly appreciated. In the following year, 1561, he was appointed minister of Holyrood-house, or, as it was sometimes styled, Canongate. But his mother tongue must soon have come back to him with fluency, for in April 1562 we find Knox requesting that he become his colleague in St Giles' Church, the help of the reader, John Cairns, not being sufficient.

When we turn to the old Burgh Records of Edinburgh we find some very interesting entries regarding this part of Craig's ministerial career, his stipend, his labours, and other matters connected therewith. Here is the first relative minute. It is of date 8th April 1562. 'The counsaile understanding the tedious and haviie lauboris sustenit be thair minister, Johne Knox, in preiching thris in the oulk and twis on the Sounday, ordanis with ane consent to solisit and persuade Master

Johne Craig, presentlie minister of Canongait to accept upoun him the half chargeis of the preaching in the said Kirk of Edinburgh, for sic guid deid as thai can aggre on.' From an entry of 11th June 1563, we learn that the stipend or 'sustentation of Master Johne Craig' was raised by the voluntary contributions of the people—'amangis the faythful quhilks hes communicat'—the same to write their names in a 'roll with the sowmes grantit.' But in a few years this voluntary system was so far, if not altogether, departed from, for in a minute of 11th September 1567, we are informed that payment was to come from certain rents or burdens on lands and buildings pertaining to the old Church, which were now vested in the Town Council, and these were ordered to be collected for 'the utilitie and profite of the ministeris, pure, and hospitalles of the Burgh.' Moreover, some months previously, as we learn from a minute of second March 1567, the Privy Council had taken the matter up, and the Burgh Records state that 'the lordis of the secreit Counsale' directed the provost and bailies to take order for 'the setting of a taxt for sustening thair ministeris, makand mention that her grace [the Queen] had gevyn the annallis for that effect,' and, add the Records, the said order of the Privy Council 'was handed to Master Johne Craig, minister.' It is interesting to note that the magistrates would stand no disrespect or impertinence shown to their minister, for in a minute of 20th June 1567, there is reference to a George Coutes who was imprisoned 'in the thieves' hole for contempt done to Master Johne Craig.' Going back a year or two, we learn from a minute of 18th August 1564, that Knox and Craig had been appointed by 'command of the kirk to depairt, the tane to the north, and the uther to the south pairtis for the preiching of the Evangell,' and that the Council

had fallen in with the Church's 'command.' They appointed 'Christopher Gudeman, minister of Sanct Androis,' to take charge of the congregation in the absence of the regular ministers, and, as indicating the kindness and generosity of the city towards its ministers, the minute goes on to say that Master John Spens, the Queen's Advocate, is to pass to Master Goodman to offer him in the name of the Town Council all honourable entertainment, and to instruct the steward of John Knox's house to 'keip table to him' at their expense, the treasurer to defray all expenses weekly.

Craig preached in the Church of St Giles with great force and courage. The pulpit at that time, as at Constantinople in the stirring days of Chrysostom, exercised the functions of the public press of modern times, and our Scottish reformer, like the great golden-mouthed preacher, boldly criticised public men and public affairs. Others of the reformers did the same, though, unlike modern editors, they were in danger of exile, or of languishing in some foul dungeon, for the honest discharge of their duty. In point of fact, the ministers then, or the courts of their church, set the earliest example of what became in later days a regular British and constitutional Opposition to the measures of arbitrary power. On the one side was a despot or a despotic court party, and on the other were the people with no leaders but the ministers. The nobles were not reliable, being for the most part self-seekers; the Scottish Parliament, with its one chamber and its Lords of the Articles, was anything but an adequate expression of the national life; the General Assembly, with its popular constitution, expressed better the feeling of the people. All through Craig's public career in Scotland, the work of political agitation had to be done by the clergy, if it was to be done at all. They

spoke out against attacks on the liberties of the nation, and gave the people information on current politico-religious topics. While doing so from the pulpit on Sundays as occasion warranted, they had also good opportunities at their bi-weekly services, and politics then pre-eminently affected matters of religion. One day Craig denounced, in no measured terms, the nobles for their rapacity in seizing the revenues of the Church. Here is what Knox says about it in his History, with the spelling and idiom modernised. 'That worthy servant of God, Mr John Craig, speaking against the manifest corruption that then, without shame or fear, declared itself, said, "Sometimes there were hypocrites known by their disguised habits, and we had men to be monks, and women to be nuns; but now all things are so changed that we cannot discern the earl from the abbot, nor the nuns from such as would be holden the noble-woman, so that we have gotten a new order of monks and nuns. But (said he) seeing ye are ashamed not of that unjust profit, would God that therewith ye had the cowl of the monk, the veil of the nun, yea, and all the rest, that so ye might appear in your own colours.'" Knox adds that these words made Maitland of Lethington very angry, and caused him to use threatening and blasphemous language towards the preachers.

Our reformer was present at the conference between Lethington, Knox, and others which took place in the year 1564, and he stoutly supported Knox's contentions. It was Maitland of Lethington who proposed that memorable conference, and it was held between certain deputies from the General Assembly on the one hand and the ministers of the Crown on the other. Its object was to restrain the liberty or, as Lethington thought, licence of preachers in dealing with the conduct of the Queen; but the general question of the amount of



obedience due from subjects to their rulers was brought into free discussion. Craig gave the conference a precedent from his experiences at Bologna. He told them that ten years before he had been present at a discussion in the University there, and heard the thesis maintained that 'All rulers, be they superior or inferior, may and ought to be refused or deposed by them by whom they are chosen, empowered, and admitted to their office, as oft as they break their promise made by oath to their subjects, because the prince is no less bound to his subjects than subjects to their princes.' He said that this had been applied in the case of a Pope, whose governor had exceeded his limits and attempted to alter the law in part of his temporal dominions. It was urged from Lethington's side that Bologna was different from Scotland, for it was only a republic or commonwealth, and Scotland was a kingdom. But to this Craig readily replied: 'My lord, my judgment is that every kingdom is or at least should be a commonwealth, albeit that every commonwealth is not a kingdom.' Historians of high repute have given prominence to the views of the reformer as expressed at this conference, for they were founded rather upon common political principles than upon religious dogma.<sup>1</sup>

Thenceforward Craig takes a prominent part in public affairs. There are those who accuse him of complicity in Rizzio's murder, and base their accusation on the fact that his name occurs in the list of persons privy to the Italian's death, as sent by the Earl of Bedford and Randolph to Cecil. But John Knox's name is also in that list, and it has been proved by Dr Thomas M'Crie, junr., and Dr Hume Brown that Knox's name should not be there; and for the same reasons, as given by these historians, Craig's name is also a fabrication.

<sup>1</sup> Craig's entire speech will be found in Note 1.

Curiously enough one of the arguments against Knox is that he hurriedly left Edinburgh at the time, but this cannot be urged against Craig, for he remained at his post.

Craig's courage is shown in his refusal to publish the banns of marriage between Mary and Bothwell. Edinburgh was in the hands of Bothwell's followers at the time, and the refusal might have cost Craig his life. The latter had an interview with that extraordinary nobleman during a sitting of the Privy Council, at which he boldly charged the wicked wooer with 'adultery, ravishing, the suspicion of collusion between him and his wife, the sudden divorcement and proclaiming within the space of four days, and last, the suspicion of the King's death.' As the accuser received no explanation on any of these points it may be asked, how was it then that he consented in the end to proclaim the banns? The answer is simple. Craig received a letter from Queen Mary which changed, or at least modified, his attitude, for in the letter the Queen declared that she was under no restraint whatever, and was indeed acting of her own free will. Accordingly Craig, after consultation with his session or congregational court, did make the proclamation but with strong protestations, declaring, among other things, that 'he abhorred and detested that marriage.' Some of his brethren, however, were not satisfied, and brought the matter before the General Assembly, but that court passed a resolution absolving him.<sup>1</sup> They suspended, however, Adam Bothwell, the bishop who performed the marriage ceremony. It has been said that the right of proclaiming or withholding these banns of marriage was vested in Knox, but that he was absent from the city at the time. This would imply that Mary was resident within the parish of St Giles. Holyrood,

<sup>1</sup> For Craig's statement to the General Assembly see Note 2

however, was in 'Canongate'; but she may have been in the Castle. On the other hand it has been said that 'Canongate' was the parish church of the Castle. But there is really no need for us to trouble ourselves with these surmises and intricacies.

Craig does not appear to have been so bitterly opposed to the Queen as most of his fellow-reformers were. At any rate we learn later from the *Diurnal of Occurrents* that at a meeting of the General Assembly held at Stirling when it was 'ordained that na minister should pray in their sermons for the Quhene and [they] fand fault with Alexander, bishope of Galloway, minister at Edinburgh, because he prayit for the said Quhene, aganis the quhilk Johne Craig opponit.' Spottiswood tells us that Craig 'gave obedience' to the request of King James that prayer be publicly offered for his mother.

It is interesting to note that our reformer had at least one interview with the ill-fated Queen. It was in June 1566, when, along with John Spottiswood, he went to Her Majesty, then residing in Edinburgh Castle, and, by instructions of the General Assembly, presented to her a supplication for the payment of ministers' stipends due to them out of 'the thirds of the benefices.' He and his fellow-deputy were graciously received, and the royal answer was favourable, though it was some time before the promise of 'certaine victuallis and money' was implemented.

John Craig is now an important personage, and is closely associated with Knox and others in church affairs. His name occurs very frequently in the *Book of the Universal Kirk* (Proceedings of the General Assembly). He is three times Moderator—in 1569-70, 1576, and 1581—and we find him on many committees and commissions. But this prominence has its dangers, for in a letter from Sir John Foster to Cecil it is stated

that one day, as Craig was sitting in the Church of St Giles, a soldier of the Queen's party struck at him with his dagger. Some years later he had a rather alarming experience after preaching a sermon on the Sunday following upon the arrest and imprisonment of the Earl of Morton. Craig had been inveighing against 'false accusations,' and Captain James Stewart, who had suddenly brought the charges against Morton, drawing his dagger angrily told the minister that the pulpit should not protect anyone who slandered him.

We learn from Bain's *Calendar of State Papers* that, at least on one occasion, Craig, when preaching in St Giles', had Lord Darnley among his hearers.

Craig's services were requisitioned not only by the ecclesiastical authorities but also by the civic. For instance, in the Burgh Records of Edinburgh we find, under date 28th April 1571, that the Town Council sent John Craig along with others to the Castle for the purpose of asking the Captain, Kirkcaldy of Grange, to allow all the King's lieges to resort to the town without danger to their lives from his 'men of weyr.' Some years before, there is a minute of the Town Council which informs us that they appointed John Craig to 'leid tryalls in probation of the qualifications and erudition' of a certain master of the High School, who was deemed by some unsuitable for his post. On one occasion we find Craig coming to a meeting of the Town Council, and 'presenting to thame our soveranis [Queen Mary's] wryting underwritten, and desynit the same to be registrat in the buik of the burgh,' the manuscript to be duly returned to him. The document in question was of the nature of a proclamation denouncing certain vices prevailing among the inhabitants, and arranging for punishment to be inflicted on the perpetrators.

Before we speak of certain important matters con-

nected with the Church, under the áuspices of the Assembly, in which Craig took part, there is an incident in his career which may now be mentioned. One day a strange document was placed in Craig's hands as he was conducting the afternoon service in St Giles', Knox having preached in the forenoon. The paper was from Kirkcaldy of Grange, and was to the effect that Knox in his sermon that day had called him a murderer and throat-cutter and had spoken in a manner impossible to justify, and it was his request that Craig should read the entire paper to the congregation. Craig could not see his way to comply with this request, but referred Kirkcaldy to the judicatories of the Church of which he still professed to be a member. The sequel is beyond the scope of this chapter, but it may be sufficient to say that Knox denied he had used such words, and, though he had spoken strongly, he said that it was more in sorrow than in anger. Between the shot and shell of Kirkcaldy in the Castle, and the shot and shell (moral and spiritual) of Knox in St Giles', Craig undoubtedly was in a dilemma, but his conciliatory disposition was of advantage to the good cause at that time. Professor Hume Brown in his *Life of John Knox*, in referring to the incident, speaks in evident appreciation of Craig, and says that his 'other actions prove him to have been a prudent person.'

Let us now look at some important church matters, connected with the Assembly, in which Craig took a prominent part. In was during his first term as Moderator that the rule, still observed, was laid down that 'the Moderator of last Assembly should open the next with exhortation and prayer.' When there was any special work of a literary kind, or requiring tactful and cautious management, Craig seems always to have been the member of Assembly chosen for it. He was



very frequently placed on what is now called the 'Business Committee,' which, in those strenuous days, was wont to meet at seven, and sometimes even at six o'clock, in the morning. Along with Knox he was appointed to draw up the 'Form and Exercise' for a great public fast, 'Robert Likprevick to print it.' This, which might be called a *Treatise on Fasting*, contains some fine passages breathing a spirit of justice and compassion. His is the first signature—he was Moderator at the time—appended to the General Assembly's letter to the 'Bishops and Pastors of England' asking them to deal gently with their brethren who had scruples about wearing surplices and 'uther abulzements.' We find him one of a number of 'generous and loving brethren' commissioned by the Assembly to approach 'the Lord Regent's Grace'—the Earl of Mar—on affairs pertaining to the church. Two or three years earlier he was appointed with others to confer with the Regent Moray on similar matters. He was also one of the deputies appointed to discuss certain high matters of state with the Duke of Châtelherault, Maitland of Lethington, Kirkcaldy of Grange, and Sir James Balfour—representatives of the Queen's party—in the Castle of Edinburgh. As this conference has been referred to in some detail in our chapter on Winram it need not detain us here; but it should be said that in the discussion we see Craig's practical nature and business tact in bringing the debate, when it was wandering, back to the main point, and we see him supporting Knox with much spirit. In the Assembly of 1575, we find him arguing against diocesan bishops, and it was on the report of a committee on which he sat that Episcopacy was abolished. He also took an important part in the composition of the *Second Book of Discipline*—'several heads of it were perused by

him,' says Wodrow. As early as the year 1574 a committee of members of Assembly was appointed for the purpose of making a selection from the Register of the Acts and Proceedings of the Church of such deliverances as were calculated to illustrate and illumine the Church's constitution, so that no member of the Assembly, or of the inferior courts, could say that he was uninstructed in these things. Nothing appears to have been done in the matter till the year 1582, when, as we learn from the *Book of the Universal Kirk*, the Assembly 'ordaines Mr [John] Craig to lay an order for collecting the Acts of the Kirk betwixt [this] and the nixt Assemblie.' In the two following years diligence is reported, and reference is made 'to the great travels tane be Mr Johne Craig' in the matter 'for the weale of the Kirk' and with 'singular fruit and profite of the whole brethren.' 'In his labouris,' the minute proceeds, 'God was to be praised.' From all of which it may be inferred that Craig was an excellent church lawyer, and, if our reformer had been clerk himself of that venerable court, he would doubtless have been, as Robert Baillie styles Johnston of Wariston in later days, 'a non-such of a clerk.' Once at least, in a matter that came before the house, Craig gave his opinion in Latin, and very likely such is the only instance of the Assembly being addressed in that tongue. It was in connection with the case of Robert Montgomery, titular Archbishop of Glasgow, and, on a particular point Craig counselled delay, saying, '*Tutius est peccare in lenitate, quam in aliam partem.*'

Like John Winram, John Craig exercised a moderating and mediating influence. Though bold and resolute enough when necessary, he was willing to compromise, and advised compromise, on occasions. There were extreme parties then, which gave him considerable trouble. One day when preaching in St Giles' from

the 130th Psalm, 'he compared,' says Calderwood 'the estate of the Kirk of God within the town to the estate of the Jews who were oppressed, sometimes by the Assyrians, sometimes by the Egyptians. He said when wicked parties contend and strive for their pride, ambition, and worldlie honour, the Kirk is always in trouble. By these speeches he offended many, because he made the cause of both parties alike. He lamented there was no neutral man to make agreement betwixt the two parties, seeing whatsoever party shall be overthrown, the countrie shall be brought to ruin.' Among those who thought Craig lukewarm were members of the High or St Giles' Church, and a coolness arising between pastor and people, an agreement was come to that they should separate; but as we shall see later there were strong and oft-renewed attempts to secure him once more as the town minister.

For the next two years, 1571-73, we find him exercising the office of the Christian ministry at Montrose, and then he moves farther north to 'illumine the dark places in Mar, Buchan and Aberdeen.' The city of Aberdeen was his chief residence while he performed what were practically the duties of 'Superintendent' in these northern parts for some six years. Not only was he recognised as an Aberdeen minister—the Assembly minutes (*Book of the Universal Kirk*) style him 'minister of New Aberdeen'—but he also did professorial work, delivering lectures to the students at the University. He may even have been Principal for some time. Wodrow in his *Collections* says that, according to some papers in his hands, 'he seems to have been Principal at Aberdeen.' In any case he had to do with an important change in the Principalship, for it fell to him to have the last Roman Catholic Principal, Anderson, removed and

to have the first Protestant Principal, Arbuthnot, inducted.<sup>1</sup>

Craig's labours in the north came to an end when, in 1579, he was appointed chaplain to the young King James VI. This necessitated his return to Edinburgh, and he held the office for over twenty years, until his death. Row tells us that when the General Assembly heard that His Majesty had made choice of Craig they 'blessed the Lord, and praised the King for his zeal.' According to contemporary documents, the designation of the royal chaplain at that time was, 'minister of the king's house,' or 'the King's Grace's minister.' The office must have brought Craig into close intimacy with George Buchanan's *quondam* royal pupil, who became 'the British Solomon,' and none perhaps knew better than this chaplain the weaknesses, foibles, shufflings, strange inconsistencies, and absurdities of 'the Most High and Mighty Prince James.' This King of Scots often quarrelled with those around him—courtiers and ministers of religion. A favourite of one day would be dismissed on the morrow; but we are not aware that he ever quarrelled—at least had any lasting quarrel—with this chaplain of the palace. Still, Craig did not hesitate to speak plainly and pointedly more than once to this 'anointed pedant' about his conduct, as we shall see later. The wonder is that a man of such rectitude, religious fervour, and high ideals should have continued chaplain in such a court for so many successive years. Craig now resided for the most part in Edinburgh; his position was one of influence and honour; he was held in high respect by the community; and his presence in the capital was of great advantage to the church.

<sup>1</sup> The fact probably is that Craig acted as Principal merely for a time, without formal induction.

Nowadays the General Assembly—at least of the United Free Church of Scotland—enjoins, through Presbyteries, the visitation of congregations to see that the work of the ministry is efficiently carried on ; but in those days the work of the royal chaplains was also passed under review, for, in the year 1591 (as we learn from Calderwood) three ministers ‘went down to the Palace of Holyrood to visit the King’s house to try what negligence was in pastors [there were two royal chaplains, John Duncanson being the other] and abuses in the family.’ The King himself was present when the visitation took place, and the visitors urged the King to have the Scriptures read at dinner and supper, and ‘willed that new elders should be chosen, the comptroller to be left out.’ This visitation must have been very thorough, for it occupied part of two days. Is there at present such ‘oversight’ on the part of the General Assembly with regard to the Very Reverend Dr Wallace Williamson and his fellow royal chaplains in Scotland, or such archi-episcopal or episcopal ‘oversight’ in England with regard to the royal chaplains there? The Scottish Church certainly did things thoroughly in the latter part of the sixteenth century. Possibly by this time Craig’s flock in the palace would all, or mostly all, be of ‘the true-blue,’ but some years earlier, in 1580, we find a resolution of the Assembly that ‘order be taken with the Papists in the King’s house.’ We do not know what Craig’s emoluments were as royal chaplain, but we know that Duncanson his colleague retained his incumbency of Stirling (for some time at least) along with the vicarage of the Chapel-Royal, and as sub-dean was entitled to a stipend of £200 ; but after his death his son stated that for a course of years no payment had been received by his father, and he presented to the King a petition for a



grant of the arrears due. We have not ascertained what the royal reply was, but possibly, as with other 'sifficators' in that reign, the crave would not be granted, or at most only a small part of it.

About this time appeared a stranger at court, who became a great favourite with the sovereign. This was Esmé Stewart, Lord D'Aubigny, a cousin of King James's father. Handsome and accomplished, the young man had been brought up in France, and was to all intents and purposes a Frenchman. Ostensibly he had come to Scotland to enquire and make arrangements about certain properties, but he was really an emissary of the Guises, sent by that astute house to restore, if possible, the French influence in Scotland. He could tell James how the French King was supreme and absolute, and instil into his mind the doctrines of divine right and passive obedience. This Franco-Scot, a few months after his arrival in Scotland, was created Earl of Lennox, and subsequently became Duke of Lennox and Lord High Chamberlain, exercising great power in the land. The fact that he was a Roman Catholic spread alarm among the Scottish people, but the young nobleman consented to become a pupil of David Lindsay, Protestant minister of Leith, and so apt was the novice in his theological studies that soon he was able to inform the General Assembly that he had now learned what evangelical truth was, and that, as a matter of fact, he had gladly signed the Confession of Faith in the Chapel-royal at Stirling. Yea, as if this were not enough, he went to St Giles' Church, Edinburgh, and there publicly proclaimed his conversion. A conversion, however, to Protestantism, and indeed to Presbyterianism, so rapid as this could scarcely be expected to allay public suspicion, and the country demanded a stronger proof and a stronger pledge of

royal and national Protestantism. Moreover, at this time the country had been alarmed by certain Popish missions, leagues, and intrigues—followed in a few years by ‘The Invincible Armada’—and the cry of ‘No Popery’ became loud and determined.

Hill Burton says that D’Aubigny’s resources were those of the idle ornamental courtier only, not of the practical statesman, and that the ‘frightened clergy’ should not have concluded that he was sent by the Guises to allure the land back to Popery. But in this our Scottish historian is mistaken. The clergy were right and their fears were justified. Dr Graves Law, in his *Introduction to Catholic Tractates of the Sixteenth Century*, says that ‘whatever may be thought of Lennox’s character or ability, the facts, now better known, amply justify the alarm of the ministers.’ Lennox was in a deep plot, and, among other proofs, Law mentions a letter from him to Tassis, the Spanish agent in France at that time, offering his services to restore religion (Roman Catholic) and to rescue Queen Mary. Moreover, at that time, this same nobleman wrote to Mary herself, as follows: ‘Madam, since my last letters, the Jesuit, named Crichton, has come to me with letters of credence from your ambassador. He informs me that the Pope and the Catholic King had decided to succour you with an army for the purpose of re-establishing religion in this island. He says it is purposed that I should be at the head of said army. I promise you on my life that when I have the army which is promised me of 15,000 men . . . I will land. Courage! then, my Majesty.’ (Spanish Cal. III. 333.)

The alarm, then, being great and justified, a declaration was drawn up in which the most obnoxious tenets and practices of Romanism were fully stated and emphatically condemned. The document was to be a

great national 'touch-stone,' says a contemporary. In this way arose the new Confession or Covenant of 1581, the drafting of which was entrusted to John Craig. The first signature appended is that of the sovereign, then come those of the royal household and of the Privy Council, the Duke of Lennox appearing among the signatories. All ministers had to sign, and all graduates of Universities. In point of fact, it was subscribed by all ranks and classes of persons in the realm, the General Assembly stamping it with ecclesiastical sanction. The name it frequently bore was 'The King's Confession,' but it was also called 'The Second Confession' (to distinguish it from that of 1560) and 'The Negative Confession,' because, while the earlier one contained a positive declaration of the reformed faith, this latter one disclaimed and repudiated the errors of the old Romish faith. Most frequently, however, this Confession has been called 'The National Covenant' and it became the basis of the better known Covenant of 1638, and of the Solemn League and Covenant of 1643. As embodied in this last, it was subscribed by Charles II. both at Speymouth and at Scone. Along with certain other documents it was, in the year 1851, given a place among the subordinate standards of the Free Church of Scotland. In the *Book of the Universal Kirk* this historical document or symbol, as drawn up by Craig, bears the title: 'Ane short and general Confessione of the true Christian Fayth and Religione, according to God's Worde, and Acts of our Parlement, subscryved by the Kingis Majestie and his Houshold, with sindrie otheris, to the glory of God, and good example of men.'

This new Confession, for in structure and contents it is really a Confession, sets forth in stately diction its relation to the 'former large Confession,' and impres-

sively declares, ' We all and every one of us underwritten protest, That after long and due examination of our consciences in matters of true and false religion, we are now thoroughly resolved in the truth by the Word and Spirit of God ; and therefore we believe with our hearts, confess with our mouths, subscribe with our hands, and constantly affirm before God and the whole world that that only is the true Christian Faith and Religion, pleasing God and bringing Salvation to men, which is now, by the mercy of God, revealed to the world by the preaching of the blessed Evangel, and is received, believed, and defended by many and sundry notable kirks and realms, but chiefly by the Kirk of Scotland, the King's Majesty, and three Estates of this realm, as God's eternal truth, and only ground of Salvation ; as more particularly expressed in the Confession of our Faith, stated and confirmed by sundry Acts of Parliament, and now of a long time has been openly professed by the King's Majesty, and whole body of this realm, both in burgh and land. To which Confession and Form of Religion we willingly agree in our consciences in all points, as unto God's undoubted truth and verity, grounded upon his written Word.' Dr Charles G. M'Crie, in his *Chalmers Lecture*, truly observes with regard to this Covenant that it is not merely a renewed adherence to the old Confession, but is an enlargement and expansion in certain directions, bringing the symbolic documents of the Scottish Church up to date, and rendering them the utterances of living men. Wodrow, in his *Collections*, says that there was also a ' Latin version by Mr Craig himself, who was an exact master of the Latin tongue.' This version was for circulation on the continent of Europe.

In this same year Craig composed the first Catechism, which the reformed Church of Scotland issued in the

language of the people. The title-page of the book has the following upon it: 'A Shorte Summe of the whole Catechisme, gathered by Mr Johne Craig, Minister of God's Worde to the King's M[ajesty] . . . Imprinted at Edinburgh by Henrie Charteris. Anno M.D.LXXXI.' The first edition of this work is one of the rarest of early printed Scottish books. No copy is to be found in the British Museum, the Bodleian, or in any Scottish University Library. The only extant copies, two in number, are to be found in the Advocates' Library, and among the bibliographical treasures of a member of the Gibson-Craig family (which family is collaterally descended from our reformer). In the year 1883 an exact facsimile was published, with a valuable introduction, by Dr Thomas Graves Law, and even that issue has become scarce, as only 100 copies were printed for sale. The title-page is as follows: 'A Shorte Summe of the whole Catechisme, wherein the Question is proposed and answered in a few wordes, for the greater ease of the commoune people and children. Gathered by Mr Johne Craig, Minister of God's worde to the King's M[ajesty]. Johne XVII. This is Lyfe Eternall, to know thee the only verie God and Jesus Christ Whome thou hast sent. Imprinted at Edinburgh by Henrie Charteris. Anno M.D.LXXXI. Cum Privilegio Regali.'

It was during his ministry at Aberdeen that Craig prepared this work, and it was for his flock there, in the first instance, it was meant. So he tells the reader in the Preface, and in making it 'commoune to otheris' he in a manner dedicates it to them. The Apostles' Creed is made the basis of the chief doctrinal teaching of this Catechism, and, while larger than the Westminster Shorter Catechism, it is simpler in form and less abstruse. The theology is distinctly Calvinistic. There was



another work by Craig, namely, *Ane Forme of Examination before the Communion*, which was prepared by the direction of the General Assembly in 1590, and ordered by the Assembly two years after to be 'read in families' and 'read and leirnit in lector schooles.' This has frequently been called 'Craig's Catechism,' but it should not be confounded with the larger work of which it is an abridgment. It took the place of 'the little Catechism,' which was the popular name of a manual, *The Maner to examine Children*, printed at the end of Calvin's Catechism. Of some interest is the following entry in the Session Records of South Leith, under date 8th August 1616: 'Every Sabbath day, efter the prayers befor the blessing, thair sall be twa bairnes, ane frae the Gramar school, that sall repeit Mr Craig's carritches openlie in the Kirk, for the instructioun of the commones; the quhilk Mr Thomas Hag, maister of the Gramer school hes promesit to obey.' The Catechism certainly became popular in Scotland. Young people were brought up on it, in longer or shorter form, and even acquired a facility in composing catechisms, which accounts for James VIth's observation at the Hampden Court Conference, 'Every son of a good woman in Scotland thinks he can write a Catechism.'

Craig's Catechism has won the admiration of many churchmen. Edward Irving reprinted it, and used it for the examination of catechumens, preferring it to that of the Westminster divines. 'The Shorter Catechism,' he said, 'is systematic; Craig's is scriptural and simple; the Shorter is intellectual; Craig's is vital; the whole subject of our union with Christ and our deriving nourishment from Him in the way of life, sorely overlooked in the Shorter Catechism, is in Craig's excellently set forth.'

It appears from the Proceedings of the General Assembly of the year 1590 that there was an objectionable reply made to the King's Confession or National Covenant. The minute of August 12th of that year reads as follows: 'Ordaines ye brether[en] of the pbrie of Edin' to peruse ye ans<sup>r</sup> sett out be Mr Craig against a pernicious wrytting put out against the Confession of Faith, together with the preface made be Mr Johne Davidsons, and, if they find meitt, the samen be published that they may be committed to prent.' Dr M'Crie, in his *Life of Andrew Melville*, says in a footnote that he does not know whether the 'answer' with its preface was ever published; but within recent years the 'pernicious wrytting' has been printed under the auspices of the Scottish Text Society with the title 'Ane Schorte Catholik Confession.' The story of the manuscript and its discovery is very interesting. Cardinal Francis Barberini had been nominated Protector of Scottish Catholics by Pope Urban VIII. in the year 1623, and exercised that office for more than fifty years, during which time it was his habit to give hospitable entertainment to Scottish pilgrims in Rome. In this way many documents relating to the affairs of their country came into his hands. The Protector before him had been Pope Urban VIII. himself, while still Cardinal Maffeo Barberini, and it was in the Barberini Library at Rome that the manuscript was discovered, this Library containing many other valuable papers relating to the Scottish Catholic mission. Dr Bellesheim, in his *Geschichte der Katolischen Kirche in Schottland*, in the year 1883 first called attention to the work, and some notes upon it were read to the *Edinburgh Bibliographical Society* in 1898, communicated by the Reverend J. Wood Brown, M.A.—an old friend and fellow-student of the present writer—Mr Wood Brown

having long made Italy his home. The full title of the work is : ' Ane schorte Catholik confession of the heades of the religion now controverted in Scotland, answering against the heretical negative confession set forth be Johne Craig in his Catechisme.' The name of the author is not given, nor is there any date affixed, but from internal evidence it is plain that the work could not have been written earlier than 1587, and it probably appeared in 1589, the year before the General Assembly refers to it. The manuscript is unfinished, and its first half is written in a different character from that of the second which is in a smaller hand. The paper also of the second half is different. The penmanship of both writers is good, being the court hand of the later years of the sixteenth century. Suddenly the writing stops, with a sentence broken off in the middle. It may be added that the treatise begins with a Catholic Confession of Faith in direct opposition to the Scottish Negative Confession, and then follows what is practically an exposition or defence of this Catholic Confession, divided into sections with separate headings. Undoubtedly this Barberini MS., in quaint old Scots, is valuable and of interest not only to the student of creeds, and of controversial theology, but also to the student of philology.

It may be stated that there was still another Confession drawn up at that time ' by the Popish bishops,' says Wodrow, ' to counter the King's Confession.' The minister of Eastwood, who cites Calderwood as his authority, calls it the ' New Confession,' and says that it was likely framed for Romanising parties to sign so that they could say they had subscribed the Confession or Covenant, which was but ' juggle and equivocation, yet those were their ordinary shifts.' Dr Sprott, in his *Scottish Liturgies*, with reference to this ' New Con-

fession' states that it is more Calvinistic than Knox's Confession of 1560, which may be true so far, but its teaching on the priestly office and on the sacraments is much more developed than Knox's.

Our theologian and reformer appears also to have been somewhat of a poet, or writer of verse, for from his pen have come the familiar 'second versions' of Psalms 102, 136, 143, and 145. It is generally understood, too, that he rendered into verse the fifteen Psalms which are initialled I. C. in the *Metrical Psalms* published at Edinburgh in 1565.

Two or three years after the issue of the National Covenant and of the Catechism, Craig was scurrilously attacked in a 'testament' by that strange product of the times, Archbishop Adamson, to whose low character and devious ways we have alluded in one, or more, of the preceding chapters. There were several letters written in the same strain by this *tulchan* prelate, with the purpose of injuring some of the most prominent and highly respected men in the Church. These strange epistles were, as a matter of fact, forgeries, for they claimed to have been written by the worthy Mr James Lawson—colleague and successor of Knox in St Giles—who had died shortly before. They are full of bitter satire and baseless calumnies showing the virulent and mendacious tongue of their writer. In a manner they remind one of some of the papers—though not written in the same fine English style—of another church dignitary of later days, the very reverend Jonathan Swift, D.D., Dean of St Patrick's, Dublin. All we shall further say about them is to characterise them in the words of Peter Blackburn, a contemporary, as 'freakish, wanton, unsupported . . . to be understood by the rule of contraries . . . and to be taken as commendations' of those who supported

men and measures 'the bishop had so much spite against.'

Craig's name frequently appears in the Register of the Privy Council, but the occasions are scarcely noteworthy, apart from certain incidents mentioned or to be mentioned in this chapter, which are gathered from other sources. For instance, we find him one day presenting himself before the Council as 'procurator' for the minister of Lauder, who had charged a certain David Douglas of Ugstoun for grievous offences against both ecclesiastical and civil law. The accused did not appear, and was 'denounced rebel.'

In the year 1584 dark clouds gathered round the Church and she had to pass through deep waters. The whole Scottish people at that time suffered shameful encroachment on their rights and liberties; and had it not been for the brave stand of many of the ministers of religion, the injury to the nation would have been still greater. A new, or rather additional, royal favourite had appeared on the scene, namely, Captain James Stewart (singularly enough, son of the good Lord Ochiltree, and brother-in-law of John Knox) who in a brief space became Earl of Arran, Lord High Chancellor, and Lieutenant-General of the kingdom. Moreover, he was appointed Governor of the castles of Edinburgh, Blackness, Stirling, and Dumbarton, the four most important fortresses in Scotland. He and the other favourite—though in their hearts they may have hated each other—hunted in couples (though not in perfect harmony), seized extraordinary power and patronage, and drove into exile many of the best men in the kingdom. Towards the Presbyterian Church and its ministers they had special antipathy, and they instilled into the mind of James VI. similar dislike and hatred. They wished the monarch to become a despot, and for a



while he fulfilled that rôle. Parliament became servile, and passed the infamous 'Black Acts,' well named for their dark inception, and for the darkness in which they were passed. It was with closed doors that the Scottish Estates gave their sanction to them. Briefly stated, these Acts declared to be guilty of treason all who declined the judgment of the King or Council in any manner whatsoever; all were also considered guilty who impugned, or sought to diminish, the power and authority of the *three* Estates of Parliament, which now brought forward the rule of the bishops; all conventions except the ordinary courts were prohibited from deliberating on civil or ecclesiastical matters without the King's special licence (which meant that no church court could assemble except when convened directly by royal authority); the bishops were commissioned by the King to make all ecclesiastical appointments and arrangements within their dioceses; and (here is what nowadays would be equivalent to placing public meetings under strict espionage, and indeed silencing the press) no one should presume in sermons or in public conferences to censure the King's conduct or the proceedings of the Council, under pain of vigorous prosecution as traitorous offenders. Such were these high-handed, tyrannical, and oppressive Acts.

Andrew Melville and many other ministers had to flee the country. But for those who remained there was additional trouble brewing. A bond was devised by the King and his adroit advisers which had disastrous results among the clergy, for, requiring to be signed within forty days, it obliged its subscribers, under pain of losing their stipends, to submit to the King as supreme over all estates, civil and ecclesiastical, and to recognise the bishops. Naturally such a document met with great opposition, and a majority of the ministers having

refused to sign it, there was added a clause to the effect that acceptance of the bond was only to be so far as its language was 'according to the Word of God.' Trouble followed, for, as with royal and parliamentary bonds, indulgences, and the like, in later Covenanting days, there ensued divisions, recriminations, and heart-burnings throughout the Church. Many now signed; others would not do so; and among the former was John Craig. He was in good company, however, for the earnest and upright John Dury signed, as did also that great friend and helper of John Knox, the now venerable and venerated John Erskine of Dun. Accordingly some wise and sincere men now counselled union among the ministers, and pled with them to co-operate in a petition for the repeal of the oppressive laws, and such a proposal or policy was about to be crowned with success when unfortunately a preacher—by name James Gibson of Pencaitland, sincere enough it may be, but not wise—introduced the subject into the pulpit in Edinburgh, and severely condemned those who had signed the bond. Craig was indignant, considering that his honour was affected by such an outburst, and he too preached a sermon—at Linlithgow—before the king and the lords of Parliament, in which he not only vindicated what he had done, but blamed the *peregrine ministers* (as he called those who had fled from the country) for much trouble, and defended the royal prerogative, extending it even unduly. Undoubtedly Craig went too far in this discourse, but as James Melville says he was 'stirred up' by the 'bitter invective' of the Edinburgh minister, and he was also very angry at some of the other doings of the extreme party. His text was Psalm 82, verse 1, 'God standeth in the congregation of the mighty; he judgeth among the gods,' and David Hume of Godscroft, in his *History of the*

*House of Douglas and Angus*, records an interesting conversation between the Earl of Angus and himself regarding the views expressed in the sermon. Dr M'Crie, in his *Life of Andrew Melville*, says that this incident would have led to consequences fatal to the Church, had not the same been allayed by the interposition of wise and moderate men who persuaded the parties to postpone the adjustment of their differences to a future period. The obnoxious 'Black Acts' were repealed, or at least rendered inoperative, not long after, and the Church once more breathed freely.

We do not think Craig was weak or vacillating in all this business.<sup>1</sup> His attitude was certainly different from that at the Knox-Lethington conference some twenty years before, but a different policy or piece of statesmanship seemed now to be required. He wanted peace in the Church; he certainly got it; and it was through this manœuvre—if it may be called so—that Melville and the other exiles were enabled to return to Scotland. It may have cost Craig a good deal, but it was perhaps what Scott of Perth, the author of *Lives of the Reformers*, declares it to have been,—'the boldest action in his political conduct.'

Still there were suspicions in many quarters, even in the highest, regarding men's words and deeds in those changeful days. King James himself had his doubts about those who were the chief actors in the shifting scenes, for we are told that one day at Falkland when he came home from the hunt, he called for a flagon, and, drinking to the hounds gathered around him, said, addressing a favourite dog: 'Tell-True, I drink to thee above all the rest of my hounds, for I will give thee more credence nor either the bishop [Adamson] or Craig.' But Craig was absolutely sincere; more-

<sup>1</sup> See Note 3.

over, he showed much courage at this time. He said distinctly that he disapproved of the Black Acts, and when the Earl of Arran one day angrily shouted, 'Who dare find fault with Acts of Parliament?' Craig fearlessly answered, 'We do find fault with everything that is repugnant to the Word of God.'

The Scottish nobles had a rough and ready way of ridding themselves of those in high places who were troubling and injuring the nation. They just kidnapped the King. More than once they had done so in Scottish history, and now we find them meting out similar treatment to King James VI., to separate him from reckless and ruthless favourites. So we have the Raid of Ruthven, which took place a year or two previous to the events just recorded. By this Raid, they brought the King a prisoner to the Castle of Ruthven, or Huntingtower, near Perth, and caused Esmé, Duke of Lennox, to flee to France, whence he never returned. The raiders also confined the Earl of Arran to one of his own castles. Craig thoroughly approved of the Raid of Ruthven, and shortly after, preaching before the King, took as his text, 'Be wise, now therefore, O ye Kings,' and reproved the royal transgressions with great freedom and point. The King wept and said to the preacher that he might have told him these things privately. 'You have been often told of them privately, but to no purpose,' replied the chaplain; 'public vice requires public reproof.' It is rather curious that, when James recovered his liberty, and the Raid of Ruthven was declared to have been treasonable, and Andrew Melville, with many others, had to flee to England, Craig, who had not minced his words in the matter, remained at his post. On another occasion, too, when danger was looming for the ministers, this remarkable man does not seem to have heeded it, though more than once he

was summoned before the Privy Council for his bold speech and action. In addition to being a brave man, he was evidently calm and cool in disposition. Two years before the Raid he had rebuked His Majesty from the pulpit for issuing a proclamation in which the ministers were severely censured for their conduct in excommunicating Robert Montgomery, *tulchan* Archbishop of Glasgow, which rebuke His Majesty took sorely to heart.

Not long after the events connected with the passing of the Black Acts, the Earl of Arran—as was the case with Lennox before him—fell from his high estate. Stripped of his honours and disgraced, he ultimately fell by the hand of the assassin. James Melville tells us of a prophecy or judgment John Craig uttered with regard to him. Arran had used very unbecoming language with reference to the clergy. He would shave their heads, he said, and pare their nails, and make them an example to all who rebelled against King and Council. He was particularly insolent to Craig, and the latter said to his face, before the King [at Falkland], ‘as the Lord is just He will humble you.’ Mockingly the Earl said, ‘I shall make thee a false friar a true prophet,’ and, so bending on his knees before him, said ‘Now, I am humbled.’ But Craig rebuked him saying, ‘No, mock the servant of God as thou wilt, God will not be mocked ; but will make thee find in earnest when thou shalt be humbled off the high horse of thy pride.’ And, adds Melville, the prediction came true, for in after days ‘James Douglas ran him off his horse with a spear, and slew him, and his carcass was cast in an open kirk near, and ere it was buried was found later by the dogs and swine.’ The place where this occurred was Symington in Lanarkshire, and he who slew Stewart—the once powerful Earl of Arran—was Sir James Douglas of Parkhead, nephew of the Regent Morton,



the murder being committed in revenge for Stewart's having brought about the trial and execution of the Regent.

Though Craig remained chaplain to the King for many years, efforts were made more than once to secure his services again as minister of St Giles'. In the year 1584, when things were so black for Presbytery, we find from the old Burgh Records of Edinburgh that the Town Council asked the King to 'nominat and assign' out of his four chaplains [His Majesty seems to have had that number in that year] two, among them John Craig, to conduct services in 'the Kirk of this burgh, destitute of pastors and teachers through the absence of their own ministers.' These latter were Lawson, Balcanquhal, and Pont, who, after publicly protesting against the Black Acts, went into voluntary exile. Later, in the same year, the Council made the request to His Majesty to 'spair' Craig at times for the same purpose. In the following year the matter was again before the Council, and they resolved that John Craig and James Hamilton be appointed 'the twa ministers of this burgh.' Craig does not appear to have fallen in with this, but, after the interval of a month or so, we find that a deputation was appointed to wait on him with the request that he should preach in the 'Hie Kirk' on a specified Sunday and 'resauve and inaugurat Maister William Watson as one of the townis ministers according to the ordour in sic caissis before.' In August of the same year they once more send a deputation to him to 'see if he will tak upon him to teach twyse in wolk in respect the town is presentlie destitute of ministers.' Moreover, we find them at this time arranging for his having a house—'the Council agreit and consentit that Maister Johne Craig, minister, haif the possessioun and occupatioun of the lugeing

sum tyme occupeit be umquhill Maister James Lawson, Minister [formerly Sub-Principal of King's College, Aberdeen, and later Craig's successor as colleague to Knox in St Giles'] and ordainis the haveris of the keyis to delyver the sam unto him.' Perhaps the house or manse was used as an inducement to get Craig to comply with their wishes, but he does not appear to have done so, for as late as 1588 the Council request their commissioners to the General Assembly to ask the Supreme Court to give them Craig as their minister. Other two names are suggested, and it is interesting to note that one of them is James Melville, nephew of the famous Andrew, and writer of the valuable *Diary*. It would appear that Craig was obdurate, persisted in his declinature, and was never again regular minister of the High Church of Edinburgh.

Still he preached there at times, and in the year 1592 a strange scene occurred when he was officiating. It may not be generally known that just as Queen Mary had her Bothwell, King James had his also. This latter was Francis Stewart, a nephew of the notorious Earl, and an illegitimate cousin of the King. For a while he was a royal favourite, and was raised to high office. But he became a troubler of His Majesty's peace, and had more than one quarrel with him. He even led an assault on the royal apartments at Holyrood with fire and sword—at least with fire and hammers—but a message having been sent in haste to the Provost, the town-bell was rung, and the citizens, following the chief magistrate down to the palace, captured some of the raiders (who were afterwards hanged), though most of them, including the Earl of Bothwell, made their escape. The King went to St Giles' to offer public thanksgiving for his deliverance, but he offered it in a manner which somehow did not commend itself to the

church's leaders, and Craig, who was the preacher that day, publicly rebuked the monarch, saying that as a warning to him (who had recently allowed certain murderous outrages, such as that of the Bonnie Earl of Moray, to go unpunished), 'God in His providence had made a noise of crying and fire hammers to come to his own doors.' The King, as was frequently his custom, rose to answer, and begged the congregation to wait and hear him, but uproar ensued, and, says Calderwood, 'Mr Craig not hearing what the King said, by reason of the throng, went his way.' But those who did hear said that the sapient observation to which this strange monarch gave utterance was, that 'if he had thought his fee'd servant would have dealt with him after that manner, he would not have suffered him so long in his house.'

It is rather curious to find that this Bothwell was looked upon as a supporter of the Presbyterians, and even of the more zealous among them. In a manner he represented those who were greatly displeased at the King's unsatisfactory dealings with conspirators and murderers; but if Bothwell did aid them, it was assuredly assistance from a strange quarter, and the helped must have been very suspicious of the helper, for this nobleman was utterly lacking in principle and decorum, and both his private life and public conduct were decidedly blameworthy. In addition to the above, there were incidents in his career which were not only daring, but grotesque and theatrical. A wild Scots earl he was, and a very son of mischief. It is surely very strange that, through the court troubles of the time—intrigues, conspiracies, murders, crimes in high places that were unpunished—there came the Magna Charta of the Church of Scotland. Just as the Earl of Moray, the 'good Regent,' had given the Church a

strong position, so his son-in-law—‘the Bonnie Earl of Moray’—by his cruel death was in a manner the cause of the Church obtaining this great Charter. For, as Calderwood suggests—and he is right—it was the obloquy that followed the unpunished crimes of Huntly, who slew Moray and thus ‘spoilt a better face than his own,’ and the unpunished crimes of other lords, that the King was constrained to make this wonderful concession to the Presbyterian Church. But while, a generation before, it was Maitland of Lethington who frustrated much of Knox’s work, so now it was another Maitland—Sir John Maitland of Thirlestane, a younger brother of Queen Mary’s former secretary—who aided the completion of Knox’s work. This Thirlestane, as Chancellor, was the King’s adviser in the matter, and though, like his elder brother, he was not at times free from the same faults which marred the former’s career, this Maitland should be accorded a high place in Scottish ecclesiastical history.

Craig was now an old man, but up till the year 1590, at least, there do not appear to have been any signs of debility. In that year he officiated with others at the Coronation of Anne of Denmark, the consort of James, and, according to Calderwood, it was his son, then a young boy, who, at the pageant prepared for the Princess’s entry into Edinburgh, made a short oration to her. Three years after, however, the King was sensible of infirmities growing on his chaplain, and sent a request to the Assembly to furnish him with a leet out of which he might select a new chaplain to ‘serve in his house in respect of Mr Craig’s decrepit age.’ Two years later, in June 1595, we learn from the proceedings of the General Assembly that the sovereign sent intimation to the brethren assembled that ‘Mr Jo<sup>n</sup> Craig is awaiting what houre it sall please God to call him, and is

altogether unable to serve any longer,' and His Majesty desired that 'ane ordinance be maid granting him any two ministers he sall chuse' for the chaplaincy. Still the old man lived for five years more and retained the status of royal chaplain to the end, for, in 1601, we read in Row's History that 'in respect of Mr John Craig his death, ministers are nominat for his Majestie's and the Queen's hous and for the Prince.' It was on the 12th day of December in the year 1600 that our reformer passed away. He was then in the eighty-ninth year of his age. Spottiswood informs us that, 'when borne down with the weight of years, he retired from Court, and forebore all public exercises, living privately at home [in Blackfriars Wynd] and comforting himself with the remembrance of the mercies of God that he had tasted in his life past.'

It is somewhat singular that another royal chaplain, John Duncanson—who has already been mentioned, and who was contemporary with our reformer and died about the same time—also lived to a great age, having reached nearly his hundredth year. One would almost think that the office was conducive to longevity, for in this present year of grace there is a royal chaplain resident in Edinburgh who is a nonagenarian, and quite recently was elected Captain of a well-known Golf Club.

We may now give some facts regarding Craig's domestic life. After he returned to Scotland, he married a lady of the name of Marion Smail or Small. A Roman Catholic writer of that time—Dr John Hamilton, a secular priest—says in his *Facile Tractise* that this lady was very young when the marriage took place—'a young lass of XV yearis auld'—which doubtless is an exaggeration, as has generally been the case when writers of that Church attack 'renegat priests' for taking to themselves wives. Moreover, this same Dr



Hamilton makes Craig to be 'about forescore yearis of age,' when he married, which is quite untrue, for at the time of his death he had a grown-up son who was a professor. But there was considerable disparity between the ages of bridegroom and bride, for the former would be about fifty years of age when he returned to Scotland after his long residence on the continent of Europe, and his widow survived him for many years. He was certainly married, however, prior to 1575, for on September 14th, 1579, he left Aberdeen for Edinburgh 'with this wife, barnis, and hail houssell,' and we learn from the 'Registry of Births at Aberdeen' (now in the Register House, Edinburgh) that the baptism of his son William is entered under date October 9th, 1575. From the Sasines and Commissary Records of Edinburgh we gather that, in addition to this son, other children were born, but their Christian names we have not been able to ascertain. 'His hail bairnes are to remain in household with thair mother while (till) thair marriage with parties honest,' and that some of these 'bairnes' were males we know, for in the Burgh Sasine under date 16th August 1594, William is mentioned as 'the eldest son.' The inventory of his effects amounted to £222, 13s. 4d., and the debts owing to him at the time of his decease amounted to £1100. He left all his books to his son William, and 100 merks to 'the Hospital of Edinburgh.' The mother and eldest son were appointed executors of the will, but they were requested to take the advice of their relative Thomas Craig, advocate. We may say a few words about this latter. A man of influence in his time, he was held in the highest esteem. A poet, an accomplished scholar, a great jurist, he was offered a Knighthood by King James, but, though he refused the honour, his sovereign said he was always to be addressed as Sir Thomas, and

he is frequently so styled in documents of the time and later. As a young man he studied and graduated B.A. at St Andrews University, and then proceeded for further study to the Continent, but, on his uncle John Craig's returning to Scotland in 1560, he put himself in his hands for further instruction, and between nephew and uncle there was, for the rest of their lives, the closest and most confidential relations. Thomas Craig was a sincere Presbyterian, and gave valuable help to the Church. William, already mentioned, the son of the reformer, was a graduate of Edinburgh University and became a regent there. Crawford, in his History of that University, characterises him as 'a very able and gracious boy.' He afterwards became a Professor of Theology at Saumur. There was close friendship between him and the great scholar Boyd of Trochrig. Returning to Scotland, he died at Edinburgh in 1616. His mother, 'Dame Craig,' survived him by fourteen years, and she survived her husband by thirty, dying in the year 1630.

We are glad to say that a portrait exists of the subject of this biography. It is a painting in oils, and is in possession of Sir H. T. Gibson-Craig, Bart. of Riccarton. The portrait conveys the idea of a large man, broad shouldered and tall. The face is a good one—full, strong, calm, intellectual—with beard and moustache somewhat of the Charles I. type. The hair of the head is abundant, reaching down almost to the shoulders, and is brushed back, undivided, from the forehead. The dress is that of a Scottish clergyman of the period—black robe, wide white-tasselled collar, and white cuffs turned over the sleeves of the cassock or jacket at the wrist. We have also seen a portrait of his nephew Sir Thomas Craig, prefixed to his Life, and there is a decided family likeness between the two men. It may

be added that John Craig is the only one of the reformers, treated of in this volume, of whom a portrait is known to exist, with the exception, of course, of Knox, whose 'vera imago' appears in the *Icones* of Beza.

We close this chapter with the following estimate, or appreciation, of John Craig in the words of three well-known Scotsmen—the first, a man about his own age, and intimately associated with him at the commencement of his public career in Scotland; the second, a man much younger in years, but who also knew him, and was intimately acquainted with the later events of his life; and the third, a well-known Scottish historian of last century. The first is John Knox, and his words (which occur in his History), brief but pregnant, are: 'that worthy servant of God Mr John Craig, that worthy minister'; the second is Archbishop Spottiswood, who says, 'This man whilst he lived was held in good esteem, a great divine and excellent preacher, of a grave behaviour, sincere, inclining to no faction, and, which increased his reputation, living honestly, without ostentation or desire for outward glory'; the third is Patrick Fraser Tytler who, in his *Life of Sir Thomas Craig of Riccarton*, pays a high tribute to the elder Craig, remarking that he exercised 'a peculiar influence upon the mind of the youthful scholar through his profound learning . . . the simplest manner and a spirit of piety which no personal dangers could shake . . . he was a man of great learning as a divine, and eloquence as a preacher; sincere and vigorous in his opposition to the government which threatened to injure the real interests of religion, but refusing his concurrence in designs which were dictated by a mean and unreasonable jealousy of the throne, and attempted to be carried out by open defiance of its authority.'

John Knox and Andrew Melville are the outstanding names which popularly represent the great times of struggle between Protestantism and Roman Catholicism, and Presbytery and Episcopacy, in this Scotland of ours in the sixteenth century ; but John Craig lived through both these conflicts and played a prominent part in them. In no small measure we are indebted to him for those principles and that polity which now prevail in the Scottish Church. An advocate and a promoter of truth and liberty, he was a builder and leader of the Reformed Church ; a good, and we may say, a great man, he was faithful and eager in duty, brave and ready in action, wise and temperate in counsel ; and the career of even John Knox himself was scarcely more varied, romantic, and eventful. Few lives indeed have surpassed that of Craig in variety of scene, variety of important personages whom it touched—witness the Emperor Maximilian II., Mary, Queen of Scots, and James VI.—and variety of incidents when a nation's history was being made ; and its romance, its influence, and its usefulness we have endeavoured to tell in these pages for the benefit of all who wish to be acquainted with the noble efforts and undying achievements of our Scottish Reformers.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Notes 4 and 5.

## APPENDIX

### NOTE I

#### CRAIG'S SPEECH AT THE KNOX-LETHINGTON DEBATE

' At last Mr Johne Craig, fellow-minister with Johne Knox in the Kirk of Edinburgh, wes requyreit to gif his jugement and vote, who said, " I will glaidlie schaw unto your Honouris what I understand ; but I gritlie doubt whidder my knowlege and conscience sall satisfy you, seeing that ye haif heard so monie ressounis and ar so lyttill moved be thaime. But yit I sall nocht conceill from you my jugement, adhering first to the protestation of my Brother, to wit, That our voitting pre-judge nocht the lybertie of the Generall Assembly. I wes (said he) in the Universitie of Bononia,<sup>1</sup> in the yeir of God 1554, whair, in the place of the Blak-Freiris of the same toune, I saw in the tyme of thair Generall Assemblie this conclusion set furth : This same I heard ressoned, determined, and concludit :—

#### " CONCLUSIO

" 'Principes omnes, tam supremi, quam inferiores, possunt et debent reformari, vel deponi per eos, per quos eliguntur, confirmantur, vel admittuntur ad officium, quoties a fide præstita subditis per juramentum deficiunt : Quoniam relatio juramenti subditorum et principum mutua est, et utrinque æquo jure servanda et reformanda, juxta legem et conditionem juramenti ab utraque parte facti.' That is ' All Reuleres, be thay supreames or be thay inferiour, may and aucht to be reformed or deposed be thame be whom thay ar chosin, confirmed, or admitted to thair office, as oft as thay brak that promise maid be the oath to thair subjects : Becaus that thair Prince is no less bound be oath to the subjects, then is the subjectis to thair Princeis, and thairfoir aucht to be keipit and reformed equallie, according

<sup>1</sup> The Latin name of Bologna.



to the law and conditioun of the oath that is maid of other partie.'

"This conclusion, my Lordis, I heard sustenit and concludit, as I haif said, in ane moist notabill auditour. The sustenar wes ane leirnit man, M. Thomas de Finola, the Rectour of the Universitie, ane man famous in that cuntrie. Magister Vincentius de Placentia, affirmed the Conclusioun to be moist true and certane, agreeable boith with the law of God and man. The occasioun of this Disputation and Conclusioun, wes ane certane disordour and tyrannie that wes attemptit be the Paipis Governouris, who began to mak innovationis in the cuntrie agains the lawis that wer befor establishit, alledging thame selfis nocht to be subject to sick lawis be ressource that they wer nocht institute be the peopill, but be the Paip, who wes King of that cuntrie; and thairfor thay haifing full commissioun and authoritie of the Paip, mycht alter and change statuteis and ordinanceis of the cuntrie, without all consent of the peopill. Agains this [thair] usurped tyrannie, the leirnit and the peopill opponit thame selfis opinie; and when that all ressource whilk the Paipis Governouris could allege wer heard and confuted, the Paip himself wes fane to tak up the maitter, and to promise to keep nocht onlie the libertie of the peopill, but also that he suld nether abrogat onie law [or] statute, nether yit mak onie new law without thair awin consent. And thairfor, my Lord [said he], my vote and conscience is, that Princes ar nocht onlie bound to keep lawis and promiseis to thair subjects, but also, that in cais they fail, thay justlie may be depositeit; for the band betwixt the Prince and the Peopill is reciproce!"

'Then start [up] ane claw-back of that corrupt Court and said, "Ye wat nocht what ye say; for ye tell us that wes done in Bononia; we ar ane Kingdome and thai ar but ane Commounwelth."

"My Lord," said he, "My judgement is, that everi Kingdom is, or at leist, sould be ane Commounwelth, albeit that everi Commounwelth be nocht ane Kingdom; and thairfor, I think, that in ane Kingdom no less dyligence aucht to be taikin, that lawis be nocht violatit, than is [in] ane Commounwelth; becaus that the tyrannie of Princeis who continwallie rule in ane kingdom, is moir hurtfull to the subjectis, than is the misgovernment of those that from yeir to yeir ar changit in fre Commounwelthis. But yit, my Lordis, to assure you and all utheris farder, that heid was disputed be the uttermoist; and then, in the end, it

was concludit, that they spak nocht of sik thingis as wer done in diverse kingdomis and natiounis be tyrranie and negligence of peopill. But we conclude," said thai, "what aucht to be done in all Kingdomis and Commounwelthis, according to the law of God, and unto the just lawis of man; and gif, be the negligence of the peopill, or be tyrannie of Princes, contrair lawis haif bene maid, yit may that same peopill, or thair posteritie, justlie craif all thingis to be reformed, according to the originall institution of Kingis and Commounwelthis; and sik as will nocht [do] so, deserve to eit the fruit of thair awin folischness."'  
—From Knox's *History of the Reformation in Scotland*.

## NOTE 2

CRAIG'S DEFENCE TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY IN THE MATTER  
OF THE PROCLAMATION OF THE BANNIS OF MARRIAGE BETWEEN  
QUEEN MARY AND THE EARL OF BOTHWELL

'The General Assemblie of the Kirk, conveneit in Edinburgh, in the Nether Tolbuith thereof, the 25 of December 1567. In the quhillk were present Erles, Lords, Barrones, Superintendents, Ministers, and Commissioners of Townes and Kirks. The invocation of God's name was made be Mr Johne Craig, ane of the Ministers of Edinburgh. For eschewing of confusion, in reasoning in this present Assemblie, was chosen Mr Johne Row, minister of St Johnstoun (Perth) to be Moderator.'

It was at 'Sess 4a 30 Decembris' that Craig was 'bruitit for proclameing the bands betwixt the Queine and the Erl Bothwell,' and his 'purgatioun . . . in wryte' was as follows:—

'To the end that all that feares God may understand my proceedings in this matter, I sall shortlie declare what I did, and what moved me to defend the same, leaving the finall judgement of all things to the Kirk. First, be the request of Mr Thomas Hepburne, in the Queen's name, to proclame her with my Lord Bothwell, I plainlie refusit, becaus he had not her hand-wryte; and also [because of] the commoun brute that my Lord had both ravischt her and keepit her in captivitie. Upon Wedinsday nixt, the Justice-Clerk brought me ane wryting subscriyvit with her hand, bearing in effect, that scho was neither ravischt nor yitt deteanit in captivitie, and therefor chargit me to proclame. My answer was, I durst proclame no baunds (and chieflie suche)

without consent and command of the Kirk. Upon Thursday nixt, the Kirk after long reasoning with the Justice-Clerk, and amangst the brethrein, concludit, that the Quein's mynde schould be publishit to her subjectis, the three nixt preaching dayes ; but becaus the Generall Assemblie had prohibited all sic marriages, we protestit, that we wold neither solemnize nor yitt approve that marriage, but wald onlie declare the Princes [Princess's] mynde to the counsellors, approvers, and performers of the mariage. And so, upon Fryday nixt, I declarit the haill mynde and progresse of the Kirk, desyreing everie man, in God's name, to discharge his conscience before the Secreet Counsell ; and to give boldnes to others. I desyrit of the lords ther present tyme and place to speeke my judgement before the parteis ; protesting, if I were not heard and satisfied, I either wald desist frome proclaiming, or els declare my mynde publickly before the Kirk. Therefor, being admittit after noone before my lord in the Counsell, I laid to his charge the law of adulterie, the ordinance of the Kirk, the law of ravisching, the suspicioun of collusioun betwixt him and his wife, the sudden divorcement and proclaiming within the space of four dayes, and last, the suspitioun of the King's death, which her marriage wald confirme. But he ansuerit nothing to my satisfioun, quherfor after many exhortatiouns, I protestit that I could not but declare my mynde publickly to the Kirk. Thairfor upon Sunday after I had declared quhat they had done and how they wald proceed quether we wald or not, I tooke heavin and earth to witnes that I abhorrit and detestit that mariage, becaus it was odious and slanderous to the world ; and, seeing the best part of the realme did approve it, either be flatterie or be their silence, I desyrit the faithfull to pray earnestly that God wald turn it to the comfort of this realme that thing quhilk they intended agains reasoun and good conscience. And, becaus I heard some persons ganging against me, I usit thir reasouns for my defensis—First, I had brokin no law be proclaiming of thir persons at their request ; Secundly, if their marriage was slanderous and hurtfull, I did weill, forewarning all men of it in tyme, Thirddie, as I had of deutie declarit to them the Princes [Princess's] will, so did I faithfullie teache them, be word and example, what God craveit of them. But upon Tuesday nixt, I was callit befor the Counsell, and acuseit, that I had past the bounds of my commissioun, calling the Princes [Princess] her

marriage odious and slanderous before the world, I ansuerit, The bounds of my commissioun quhilk was, the Word of God, guid lawes, and naturall reasoun, were able to prove whatsoever I spake ; yea, that their awn conscience could not but beare witnes that sic a mariage wald be odious and scandalous to all that sould heare of it, if all the circumstances thereof were rightlie considerit. But quhill I was coming to my probatioun my Lord put me to silence, and sent me away. And so, upon Wedinsday, I first repeatit and ratified all things befor spoken, and after exhortit the brethrein not to accuse me, if that mariage proceidit, bot rather themselves, who wold not, for feare, oppone themselves, but rather sharpit their tongues against me, becaus I admonished them of their duetie, and I sufferit not the cankerit consciences of hypocrites to sleip at rest ; protesting at all tymes to them, that it was not my proclaiming, bot rather their silence that gave anie lawfulnessse to that mariage : For as the proclaiming did take all excuse fra them, so my privie and publick impugnatioun did save my conscience sufficientile ; And this farre I proceidit in this mariage, as the Kirk of Edinburgh, Lords, Erles, and Barons, will beare me witnes.

‘ Now, seeing I have been shamefullie slaunderit both [in England and] Scotland, by wrong informatioun, and false report of them that hatit my ministrie, I desyre, first, the judgement of the Kirk ; and nixt, the same to be publishit, that all men may understand quhether I be worthie of sic ane brute or not.’—From *The Booke of the Universall Kirk of Scotland*.

## NOTE 3

## CRAIG'S LETTER ON SUBSCRIBING THE BOND, 1584

The following is the Letter, as preserved by Calderwood, and it seems a wise, conciliatory, and brave document. The appendix, or postscript, shows that it was sent out with the approval of the King :—

‘ Brethrein, after my verie heartlie commendatiouns, I doubt not but ather yee have heard, or will heare shortlie, how Johne Duncansone and I have subscribed the obligatioun of obedience unto the King's Majestie and Commissioners, according to the Act of Parliament. Wherof, becaus sinister reports

may passe, both of the King's Majestie commanding, and us obeying, I thought good to make you privie to the samine. It hath pleased his Majestie to grant to Johne Duncanson and me, to confer with himself privilie, and thereafter with my lords the Erle of Arran and Secretarie, his Majestie being present in the cabinet. Where, after reasouns heard and propound on every side, in end, two heeds were agreed upon : First, that our subscription was nather sought to be allowance, ather of the Acts of Parliament, or of the state of the bishops, but to be a testimonie of our obedience to his Majestie : Nixt it was not craved, but according to the Word of God, and, therefore, our obligatioun conteaneth nothing but our obedience to the King's Majestie his lawes and commissioners, according to the Word of God. Which two heeds are so reasonable, that no man can refuse the samine, who loveth God or the quietness of the Kirk or common weale. Therefore, I pray you, to shew this to the brethrein whom yee may advertise, ather by word or by writt ; that they being informed of the good meaning of his Majestie may be conformable to the samine, to the end that the Evangell, having free passage with quietnesse and peace, evill affected persons, who of the schisme of the Kirk or commounwealth make their advantage, may be frustrated of their expectatioun.'

' REX,

' We declare by these presents, that this letter within conteaned was written with our knowledge, and directed at our command, to certifie all men of our good meaning, that none sould have occasion to doubt of the same.'

#### NOTE 4

MEMORIAL BRASS TABLET IN ST GILES'

' 1512

JOHN CRAIG

1600

' For many years a Dominican Friar who, in Italy, embraced the Reformed Faith, and was by the Inquisition at Rome condemned to be burnt. Escaping to his native country, he became Assistant to John Knox at St Giles' and Minister of the King's Household. He was the author of the King's Confession



or National Covenant of 1581. He died in Edinburgh in his eighty-ninth year.'

There is also a Memorial Window to Craig (with other Reformers) in the Banqueting Hall of Edinburgh Castle.

## NOTE 5

## LATIN EPITAPH

There is to be found in the autograph MS. of unpublished poems by Professor John Johnston of St Andrews (1570-1612), the following first rude sketch of an epitaph on Craig :—

Joannes Rupanus sive Craigius  
Ecclesiastes primum Abredonensis  
Deinde Regius. Cui S.P.Q.  
Abredonensis nomine hunc tumulum  
Inscripsi—qui Doctor quondam meus  
Obiit, 12 Dec. anno Christi 1590 (1600)  
Aetatis 89.

The ' Doctor meus,' of course, means ' my teacher.' Principal Story in his Lecture styles him Dr Craig, but does not mention why he gives him the doctorate.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- KNOX's *History*.  
Row's *History*.  
Calderwood's *History*.  
Spottiswood's *History*.  
Leslie's *History*.  
Keith's *History*.  
Bannatyne's *Memoriales*.  
*Diurnal of Occurrents*.  
*Booke of the Universall Kirk*.  
James Melville's *Diary*.  
Sir James Melville's *Memoirs*.  
Law's *Craig's Catechism*.  
*Ane Short Catholic Catechisme*. Scottish Text Society.  
Marwick's *Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Edinburgh*.  
Wodrow's *Miscellany*.  
Tytler's *Life of Sir Thomas Craig of Riccarton*.

- Hume of Godscroft's *History of the House of Douglas and Angus*.  
 Hew Scott's *Fasti Ecclesiæ Scoticanæ*.  
 Bain's *Calendar of State Papers*.  
*Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*.  
 Hay Fleming's *Mary Queen of Scots*.  
 M'Crie's *Knox*.  
 M'Crie's *Melville*.  
 Chambers's *Dictionary of Eminent Scotsmen*.  
 Anderson's *The Scottish Nation*.  
 Grub's *Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*.  
 Hume Brown's *History of Scotland*.  
 Hill Burton's *History of Scotland*.  
*Dictionary of National Biography*. Art. 'Craig,' by Prof. Æneas Mackay, LL.D.  
*Encyclopædia Britannica*. Art. 'Craig,' by Prof. Albert F. Pollard, M.A., F.R. Hist. Soc.  
*Scottish Historical Review*, vol. iii. 58, vol. xii. 278-9 and note.  
*Lecture on John Craig, D.D.*, by Rev. Robert Herbert Story, D.D., Minister of Rosneath (privately printed in 1884).  
 Sprott's *Scottish Liturgies*.  
 Sprott's *Book of Common Order* (Knox's Liturgy).  
 Law's *Collected Essays and Reviews*.

## POSTSCRIPTUM

### ADDITIONAL NOTE ON JOHN WILLOCK

Besides the six letters of Willock referred to in Chapter III., there are five to be found in Bain's *Calendar of State Papers*. Four of these are to Cecil and one to Randolph, and they seem to indicate the influential position held by this Scottish Reformer, corresponding as he does with men of such high standing. The letters deal with the unsettled state of affairs generally in Scotland, and more particularly with 'Irishe' troubles in the west country, and the 'stubborne' attitude of many of the nobles towards the Regency. But what most concerns us are two allusions to Loughborough and the 'parsonage' or 'advouison' there. Willock was anxious to retain the living, though non-resident (his duties in Scotland being pressing), and he asks Cecil to arrange the matter. In the same *Calendar of State Papers* we have a letter from Randolph to Cecil, strongly supporting Willock's request, the writer hoping that the English statesman will be 'a mean to her Majesty [Queen Elizabeth] for her gracious license to him to enjoy' the same, Willock being willing to find 'a sufficient man to discharge his duty.' Randolph further states that Willock does not wish any of the emoluments while his *locum tenens* does the work—'the revenues' (doubtless after paying the substitute) to go 'to Godly uses.' We may be sure the request was granted, as the alternative seemed to be 'a papish priest' getting the living 'to the great slander of the Queen's Godly proceedings.' This letter of Randolph shows the writer's high regard for Willock as friend and patriot. The last of the letters (to Cecil, of date July 8th, 1568) has an important reference to the English incumbency, for Willock there says: 'Touching my own state, I have easilie obtained license of the wholle, as well Regent as Church, to returne to my old rowme in Loughborowe, whereof I praise God.' John Willock's heart seems to have been there. In this same letter he thus speaks of the Earl of Moray: 'The Lord Regent myndeth verrey well—as well towards religion as justice—God grant him power to performe.'



# INDEX

## A

ABERDEEN, 108, 336, 368, 375.  
 Adamson, Archbishop Patrick, 205,  
 206, 207, 332, 338, 379.  
 Adamson, Elizabeth, 61, 69.  
 Alane (Alesius), 29, 169, 309, 316.  
 Alva, Duke of, 51, 88.  
 Andrews, St, 55, 102, 103, 106, 107,  
 116, 117, 124, 166, 167, 174, 175,  
 182, 183, 195, 204, 216, 316, 337,  
 340, 350.  
*Ane Forme of Examination*, 376.  
 Arbroath, 95, 342.  
 Arbuckle, Friar, 174, 218.  
 Argyll, Countess of, 50, 291.  
 Argyll, Earl of, 23, 63, 109, 144,  
 286, 309.  
 Arnold, Matthew, 38.  
 Arran, Earl of, 61, 62, 109, 146, 184,  
 228, 282.  
 Assembly, First General, 33, 44, 46,  
 Assembly, Latin spoken in General,  
 367.  
 Atholl, Earl of, 248, 249.  
 Ayr, 22, 96, 127, 130, 131, 145.  
 Ayrshire, 22, 60, 119, 130, 132.  
 Aytoun, Professor, 234.  
 Aytoun of Kinaldy, John, 194.

## B

BALLINGRY, 192-193.  
 Ballochmyle, 60.  
 Balnaves, Henry, 137, 176.  
 Bancroft, Bishop, 42.  
 Bannatyne, Richard, 69, 117, 158,  
 199, 204, 297.  
 Barlow, Bishop, 159, 164.  
 Barnweil, 5.

Barr, 22.  
 Barron, James, 61.  
 Bassinden, Thomas, 237.  
 Beaton, Archbishop, 132, 136, 147,  
 148, 340.  
 Beaton, Cardinal, 9, 67, 68, 93, 140,  
 167, 169, 171, 173, 189, 232, 282,  
 284, 317, 318.  
*Beggars Summons*, 82.  
 Bernard, Saint, 84.  
 Berwick, 119, 138.  
 Beza, Theodore, 316, 321, 393.  
 Black, Friar John, 149, 150.  
 'Black Acts, The,' 381-384.  
 Bodin, Jean, 74.  
 Bologna, 98, 351, 352, 354, 395.  
 Borthwick, Sir John, 188-190.  
 Bothwell, Earl of, 61, 62, 77, 362,  
 397.  
 Bothwell, Francis Stewart, Earl of,  
 387, 388.  
 Bowes, Mrs, 70, 71, 133.  
 Bowes, Marjory (wife of John Knox),  
 71, 125.  
 Boyd, Lord, 132, 146.  
 Brand, John, 186, 337.  
 Brown, Dr Hume, vi, 33, 104, 130,  
 185, 361.  
 Bucer, 352.  
 Buchanan, George, 3, 31, 58, 89,  
 202, 208, 242, 262, 286, 312, 314,  
 324, 332.  
 Buckle, 87.  
 Bullinger, 133, 134, 138, 145,  
 240.  
 Burghley (Cecil), Lord, 51, 58, 119,  
 157, 184, 361, 363, 403.  
 Burleigh, Lord Balfour of, 332.  
 Burne, Nicol, 71, 151, 152, 171, 326.  
 Burns, Robert, 17, 48, 60, 97.  
 Burton, Hill, vii, 4, 75, 94, 116,  
 234, 315.



## C

- CAIRD, PRINCIPAL, 53.  
 Calderwood, David, 26, 124, 142, 166, 176, 202, 253, 292, 326, 327, 331, 388.  
 Calvin, John, 4, 28, 31, 34, 40, 66, 80, 85, 91, 93, 114, 300, 316, 350, 352.  
 Campbell of Kinzeanleuch, Robert, 59.  
 Carberry Hill, 306.  
 Carlyle, Thomas, vi, 6, 29, 42, 66, 123, 239.  
 Carnell, 22.  
 Carswell, John, 167.  
 Casket Letters, The, 157.  
 Cassilis, Earl of, 153.  
*Catechism, Archbishop Hamilton's*, 177, 180-182.  
*Catechism, Craigs'*, 374-376.  
 Cecil (see Lord Burghley).  
 Chalmers of Gadgirth, James, 22, 57.  
 Chaplains, Royal, 370.  
 Charles I., 123, 239, 293.  
 Charles II., 373.  
 Chateaubriand, 94.  
 Chatelherault, Duke of, 63, 72, 140, 146, 153, 186, 200, 296, 366.  
 Christison, William, 167.  
 Columba, St, 119.  
 Colville of Cleish, Robert, 224, 234.  
*Confession of Faith*, 17, 24, 32, 156, 167, 184, 185, 238, 288.  
 Cooper, Professor, viii, 135.  
*Covenant, National*, or 'King's Confession', 373, 374, 401.  
 CRAIG, JOHN, 186, 200, 350-402.  
 Craig, Thomas, advocate, 391, 392, 393.  
 Cranmer, Archbishop, 282, 315, 316.  
 Cranston, Principal William, 317.  
 Crofts, Sir James, 86.  
 Cromwell, Oliver, 83, 84, 90, 117, 239.  
 Crossraguel, 95, 97, 136, 171.  
 Cuthbert's Church, Saint, Edinburgh, 313.

## D

- DACRE, LORD, 351.  
 Darnley, Lord, 4, 52, 127, 197, 198, 246, 263, 285, 364.

- D'Aubigny, Lord (Duke of Lennox, etc.), 371, 372, 373, 384, 385.  
 Davidson, Professor A. B., 235, 236.  
 Davidson, John, 331.  
 Dieppe, 4, 74, 114, 119.  
*Discipline, First Book of*, 19, 32, 45, 48, 54, 85, 90, 91, 93, 102, 103, 104, 157, 167, 185, 187, 238, 288, 301.  
*Discipline, Second Book of*, 45, 84, 238, 334, 366.  
 Dorset Marquis of, 133, 134, 138.  
 DOUGLAS, JOHN, 146, 168, 169, 171, 186, 199, 203, 205, 206, 299, 300, 308-349.  
 Douglas, Sir George, 65.  
 Dryburgh, 106.  
 Dunblane, 226, 310.  
 Duncanson, John, Principal and Royal Chaplain, 370, 390, 399.  
 Dundee, 109, 140.  
 Dunkeld, 110, 310.  
 Durie, John, 235, 249, 382.

## E

- Ecclesiæ Scoticanæ Statuta*, 68, 111, 176, 181, 221.  
 Edinburgh, 23, 58, 110, 122, 126, 138, 140, 141, 143, 145, 208, 233, 249, 337, 357, 362, 369, 389, 391.  
 Edward VI., 21, 61, 132.  
*Edward VI., Prayer Book of*, 26, 28, 141.  
 Elgin, 108.  
 Elizabeth, Queen, 51, 72, 73, 77, 122, 137, 157-158.  
 Elphinstone, Bishop, 333.  
 Emden, 135, 138, 159.  
 Erasmus, 12, 99, 170, 180.  
 Erskine of Dun, John, 22, 58, 60, 79, 138, 145, 167, 202, 306, 314, 324, 334, 382.  
 Eusebius III., Pope, 170.  
 Exhorters, 146, 269.

## F

- FERGUSON, DAVID, minister of Dunfermline, 108, 167  
 Finlayston, 22.  
*First Blast of the Trumpet, etc.*, 4, 72, 74.

Fleming, Dr Hay, 71 (note), 108,  
122, 190, 336.  
Fleming, Lady, 72.  
Flodden, 281, 350.  
Forfarshire, 22.  
Forrest, David, 60.  
Foxe, John, martyrologist, 133, 176,  
182.  
Frankfort, 114.  
Friesland (Emden), Duchess of, 135,  
136.  
Froude, 12, 51, 118.

G

GADGIRTH, 22, 57.  
Galt, John, 64, 65.  
Geneva, 1, 21, 55, 90, 91, 119, 140.  
*Gesta Romanorum*, 7.  
Giles', Saint, Edinburgh, 23, 75, 110,  
111, 139, 142, 356, 357, 364, 367,  
368, 371, 386, 400.  
Gladstone, W. E., 178.  
Glasgow, 107, 130, 145, 147.  
Glencairn, Earl of, 22, 61, 132, 146,  
262, 283, 315.  
Goodman, Christopher, 167, 226, 359.  
Gordon, Bishop Alexander, 182.  
Gouda, Nicolas de, 10, 194.  
Gowrie Conspiracy, 245.  
Green, J. R., 54.  
Gregory XIII., Pope, 122.  
Grey, Lady Jane, 132, 145.  
Greyson, John, 181, 182.  
Grub, church historian, 151, 176, 187.  
*Gude and Godlie Ballatis*, 20.  
Guthrie, Lord, 18, 254.

H

HAILES, LORD, 177, 179.  
Hallam, 105.  
Hamilton, Archbishop, 52, 101, 157,  
173, 177, 178, 179, 184, 185, 186,  
317, 340, 350.  
Hamilton, Archibald, 344, 345.  
Hamilton, John, 355, 350.  
Hamilton, Patrick, 19, 166, 172,  
316.  
Hamilton, Robert, 324, 342, 344, 345.  
Hamilton of Bothwellhaugh, 297.  
Harlaw, William, 138, 151, 313.

Hastie, Professor, 40.  
Hay, Archibald, 9, 318.  
Henry VIII., 51, 76, 132.  
Hepburn, Archbishop, 309, 310.  
Heriot, Adam, 167, 171.  
'Hildebrandism,' Presbyterian, 44.  
Holyrood, 72, 107, 370.  
Howe, John, 160.  
Hume of Godscroft, 331, 382.  
Huntingdon, Earl of, 135 (note), 158,  
160, 163.  
Huntly, Earl of, 142, 389.

I

*Icones*, Beza's, 393.  
Iona, 119.  
Irving, Edward, 376.

J

JAMES I., 11.  
James IV., 284.  
James V., 8, 11, 43, 188, 189, 196  
223, 282, 333.  
James VI., 11, 27, 33, 34, 77, 123,  
195, 203, 237, 239, 253, 290, 292,  
307, 334, 338, 363, 369, 371, 373,  
380, 383, 384, 387, 389.  
Jedburgh, 49, 106, 167.  
Johnston, Professor, 164, 212, 253,  
401.  
Julius III., Pope, 229, 318, 340.

K

KEITH, BISHOP, 148, 150, 176, 184,  
240.  
Kelso, 106.  
Kennedy, Alexander, martyr, 281.  
Kennedy, Abbot Quintin, 96, 97,  
100, 136, 171, 288.  
Kethe, William, 19.  
Kilmaccolm, 22.  
'King's Confession, The' (National  
Covenant), 373, 374.  
Kinzeancleuch, 22, 60.  
Kirkcaldy of Grange, 57, 121, 127,  
141, 190, 199, 200, 201, 297, 364  
365, 366.

Kirkoswald, 5.

KNOX, JOHN, 1-129, 133, 137, 138,  
139, 140, 141, 150, 151, 154, 157,  
158, 161, 167, 168, 171, 172, 174,  
183, 186, 201, 226, 234, 239, 242,  
247, 274, 282, 283, 296, 297, 314,  
332, 339, 357, 359, 362, 365, 393,  
395, 400.

## L

LAING, DR DAVID, 9 (note), 176,  
308, 333.

Lambeth Conference, 39.

Lang, Andrew, 13, 59, 69, 111,  
316.

Langside, Battle of, 78, 291, 293.

La Rochelle, 114.

Latimer, Bishop, 76.

Laud, Archbishop, 42.

Lauder, John, 67, 215.

Law, Dr T. Graves, 162, 179, 372,  
375.

Lawson, James, 298, 312, 379, 386,  
387.

Lee, Principal, 212, 308, 320, 340.

Lee, Professor Robert, 29.

Leicester, Earl of, 158.

Leith, 142, 143, 298, 348, 376.

Leith Convention, 202, 299.

Leith, Father Forbes, 13, 100.

Lennox, Earl of, 284, 285.

Leslie, Bishop, 11, 125, 149, 162,  
350.

Lindsay, David, minister at Leith,  
167, 289, 298, 371.

Lindsay, Principal, 86.

Lindesay, Robert (Pittscottie), 117,  
139, 172, 215, 338, 348.

Linlithgow, 149, 382.

Liturgy, Knox's, 25, 27, 28.

Locke, Mrs, 70, 183.

Logie, Gavin, 166.

Loretto, 223, 262.

Lorraine, Cardinal of, 77, 263.

Loughborough, 135, 159, 162, 403.

Louvain, 98, 316.

Luther, Martin, 5, 10, 21, 31, 43,  
85, 91, 114, 300, 303, 316.

Lyndsay, Sir David, 7, 8, 67, 108,  
120, 169, 176, 224, 333.

## M

MACAULAY, LORD, 241.

MacEwen, Professor, 31, 104.

Maclaren, Ian, 46.

M'Crie, Dr Thomas, 64 (note), 140,  
176, 177, 178, 211, 212, 227  
(note), 234, 377, 383.

M'Crie, Dr Thomas, junior, 361.

M'Crie, Dr Charles G. 374.

Maitland, Dr F. W., 1, 73.

Maitland of Lethington, 32, 33, 57,  
58, 59 (and note), 66, 137, 185,  
199, 201, 247, 360, 366, 389, 395.

Maitland of Thirlestane, Sir John,  
389.

Major, John, 99, 173, 180, 281.

Mar, Earl of, 23, 61, 105, 286, 334.

Margaret, Queen, 98.

Marischal, Earl, 144.

Martyr, Peter, 26, 311.

Mary, Queen of Scots, 2, 27, 33, 58,  
63, 74, 76, 77, 87, 104, 113, 116,  
119, 144, 152, 153, 197, 239, 242,  
246, 282, 285, 288, 291, 292, 306,  
362, 372, 397.

Mary of Lorraine, Queen Regent,  
16, 55, 56, 62, 64, 72, 78, 116,  
135, 142, 143, 144, 145, 149, 195,  
263.

Mary I., Queen of England, 72, 115,  
135.

Mathieson, Wm. Law, 34, 42, 108.

Maxwell, Robert, master of Glasgow  
Grammar School, 149.

Maxwell, Sir Wm. Stirling-, 92.

Maybole, 95.

Medici, Catherine de, 72.

Melanchthon, 189, 316.

Melrose, 106, 113.

Melville, Andrew, 3, 33, 34, 42, 84,  
89, 212, 236, 247, 311, 381, 394.

Melville, James, 16, 18, 61, 68, 235,  
252, 311, 315, 339, 382, 387.

Melville, Sir James, 158.

Melville, John, 191.

Methven, Paul, 49 *et seq.*, 167, 313.

Metrical Psalms, 379.

Milton, John, 1, 81.

Mitchell, Professor, 84, 178, 179,  
308, 315.

Moffat, Professor, 29.

Montrose, 16, 20, 59.

Moray, Earl of (Lord James Stewart),  
vi, 19, 23, 52, 61, 63, 88, 109,  
139, 144, 158, 170, 184, 185, 195,  
196, 232, 237, 247, 286, 296, 315,  
317, 388, 403.  
Moray, The Bonnie Earl of, 388,  
389.  
Morton, Earl of, 61, 75, 120, 158,  
183, 202, 203, 204, 205, 247, 308,  
327, 331, 332, 334.  
Mylne, Abbot Alexander, 44.  
Mylne, Walter, 182.

## N

NEWMAN, CARDINAL, 84.  
Norfolk, Duke of, 158.  
Northumberland, Duke of, 25, 61.

## O

OBERT, SAINT, 266, 267.  
Ochiltree, Lord, 22, 60, 61, 71, 132,  
146, 380.  
Ogilvie, John, Jesuit missionary, 52.  
Orders, ordination, etc., 25, 46, 151,  
152, 180, 241.

## P

PARKHURST, BISHOP, 133.  
*Pater Noster* Controversy, 175-176.  
Patrick, Dr David, 68, 111, 176,  
181, 221.  
Paul III., Pope, 318.  
Paul IV., Pope, 10, 229, 353.  
Peebles, 147, 148.  
Perth, 109, 132, 154, 233, 237, 248,  
263, 268, 284, 331.  
Philip II., 76, 372.  
Pius IV., Pope, 357.  
Pole, Cardinal, 76, 351.  
Pollen, Father, 59 (note), 78, 194.  
Pont, Robert, 202, 386.  
Portmoak, 196, 197, 208.  
Provincial Councils, 175, 177, 181,  
218.

## R

RAID OF RUTHVEN, 384.  
Rainy, Principal, 38, 123.  
Rait, Professor, 61.

Randolph, Thomas, 58, 119, 146,  
184, 185, 361, 403.  
Readers, 141, 146, 250, 264, 269.  
Ridley, Bishop, 4, 26.  
Rizzio, David, 93, 120, 198, 361.  
Rollock, Principal, 233.  
*Rotuli Scotiae*, 100.  
Row, JOHN, 79, 167, 168, 223-271,  
297, 315.  
Row, John, *secundus*, 32, 230, 233,  
243, 257, 299 (note), 354, 390.  
Row, John, *tertius*, 259.  
Row, William, 253, 255.  
Row, William, *secundus*, 261.  
'Rubric, The Black,' 26.  
Ruskin, 70, 107.  
Russell, Jerome, martyr, 281.  
Rutherford, John, Provost and Prin-  
cipal, 204, 330, 335.  
Ruthven, Lord, 63, 79, 110, 146,  
244, 245, 255, 265.  
Ruthven, Raid of, 384.

## S

*Sadler* (or *Sadleyr*) *Papers*, 137, 283.  
Sandilands, Sir James, 23, 57, 285.  
Savonarola, 66, 91.  
Scholarship of the Reformers, 3-4,  
313-316.  
Sciennes (Siena), 225.  
Scott, Rev James, of Perth, vii, 263,  
383.  
Scott, Sir Walter, 11, 65, 107, 113,  
117, 356.  
Sempill, Robert, 206.  
Serf, Saint, 221.  
Sermoneta, Cardinal, 10, 107, 228.  
Servetus, 91, 93.  
Seton, Lord, 139, 300.  
Settlement, Revolution, 34.  
Sforza, Cardinal, 229.  
Sharp, Archbishop, 52.  
Skene, William, 335, 344, 345.  
Smeaton, Principal Thomas, 118.  
Solway Moss, 282.  
SPOTTISWOOD, JOHN, 149, 154, 167,  
171, 272-307, 315.  
Spottiswood, Archbishop, 52, 58, 89,  
107, 108, 143, 162, 167, 168, 175,  
176, 229, 272, 292, 298, 301, 302,  
303, 354, 390, 393.

# 410 MAKERS OF THE SCOTTISH CHURCH

Spottiswood, Bishop, 301, 306.  
 Stanley, Dean, 38, 170, 210, 211.  
 Stevenson, R. L., 18, 74.  
 Stewart, Archbishop Alexander, 170.  
 Stewart, Captain James, Earl of Arran, 364, 380 *et seq.*, 385.  
 Stewart, Margaret, wife of John Knox, 71, 125.  
 Stirling, 203, 226, 243, 246, 268, 291, 336, 363, 370, 371.  
 Suffolk, Duke of, 132, 134, 135, 145.  
 Sunday observance, 32.  
 Superintendents, 145, 146, 147, 243, 246, 273, 274.  
 Swinburne, 72, 75.  
 Syme, James, 60, 138.

## T

THORNTON, JAMES, 231, 262.  
*The Maner to examine Children*, 376.  
*The Twa-Penny Faith or Godlie Exhortatioun*, 179.  
 Torphichen, Lord, 23, 285.  
 Tout, Professor, 50.  
 Tytler, vii, 121, 125, 393.

## U

ULMIS, JOHN AB, 134, 138.  
 Union, Church, 35, 41.

United Free Church of Scotland, 35, 46, 55, 370.  
 Urban VIII., Pope, 377.

## W

WALLACE, ADAM, martyr, 176.  
 Wardlaw, Alexander, 192.  
 Watson, Peter, 192.  
 Wedderburn, The Brothers, 20.  
 Welsh, John, 36.  
 Whittier, 111.  
 Wilkie, Sir David, 18.  
 WILLOCK, JOHN, 130-165, 167, 168, 171, 190, 241, 272, 315, 403.  
 Wilson, Dean John, 182.  
 Wilson, President Woodrow, 36, 37.  
 Wingate (Winzet), Ninian, 11, 16, 25, 149.  
 WINRAM, JOHN, 154, 166-222, 297, 312, 327, 335, 343.  
 Winram, George (Lord Liberton), 169.  
 Wishart, George 166, 172, 173, 214, 316.  
 Witherspoon, Dr John, 36.  
 Wodrow, vii, 150, 180, 302, 307, 366, 374, 378.  
 Wycliffe, 100.

## Z

ZWINGLI, 80, 300.





TELEPHONE: 31268 (2 LINES)

**JAMES THIN**

NEW AND SECOND-HAND BOOKSELLER

54, 55, 56 SOUTH BRIDGE, EDINBURGH, 1

M

*M. G. Brain*

*New Collex C 1*

SOLD BY

*JA*

DATE

*30-12-48*

*Patrick Hamilton*

*1-6*

*Wilson & Marcion*

*3-*

*Hewart: makes*

*5*

*of Scottish*

*Church*

*9/6*

*A/C*

00594 - 23

LPS

2  
7  
111

ER  
385  
H48  
1920

Hewat, Kirkwood.

Makers of the Scottish church at the  
Reformation / by Kirkwood Hewat. --  
Edinburgh : Macniven & Wallace, 1920.  
ix, 410 p. ; 22 cm.

Includes bibliographical references  
and index.

Contents: John Knox -- John Knox  
(continued) -- John Willock -- John  
Winram -- John Row -- John Spottiswood  
-- John Douglas -- John Craig.

1. Reformation--Scotland. 2.  
Reformation--Scotland--Biography. 3.  
Scotland--Church history--16th century  
I. Title

556982



